THE REVOLT AGAINST CIVILIZATION

LOTHROP STODDARD

HERITAGE

The Revolt Against Civilization

The Menace of the Under Man

By Lothrop Stoddard, A.M., PH.D (Harvard)

Contents

Preface

Chapter I—The Burden of Civilization

Chapter II—The Iron Law of Inequality

Chapter III—The Nemesis of the Inferior

Chapter IV—The Lure of the Primitive

Chapter V—The Groundswell of Revolt

Chapter VI—The Rebellion of the Under-Man

Chapter VII—The War Against Chaos

Chapter VIII—Neo-Aristocracy

PREFACE

THE revolutionary unrest which to-day afflicts the entire world goes far deeper than is generally supposed. Its root-cause is not Russian Bolshevik propaganda, not the late war, not the French Revolution, but a process of racial impoverishment, which destroyed the great civilizations of the past and which threatens to destroy our own. This grim blight of civilized society has been correctly diagnosed only in recent years. The momentous biological discoveries of the past generation have revealed the true workings of those hitherto mysterious laws of life on which, in the last analysis, all human activity depends. In the light of these biological discoveries, confirmed and amplified by investigations in other fields of science, especially psychology, all political and social problems need to be re-examined. Such a re-examination of one of these problems—the problem of social revolution—has been attempted in the present book. —LOTHROP STODDARD BROOKLINE, MASSACHUSETTS, March 30, 1922

CHAPTER I—THE BURDEN OF CIVILIZATION

CIVILIZATION is the flowering of the human species. It is both a recent and a fragile thing. The first glimmering of genuine civilization appeared only eight or ten thousand years ago. This might seem a long time. It does not seem so long when we remember that behind civilization's dawn lies a vast night of barbarism, of savagery, of bestiality, estimated at half a million years, since the ape-man shambled forth from the steaming murk of tropical forests, and, scowling and blinking, raised his eyes to the stars.

Civilization is complex. It involves the existence of human communities characterized by political and social organization; dominating and utilizing natural forces; adapting themselves to the new man-made environment thereby created; possessing knowledge, refinement, arts, and sciences; and (last, but emphatically not least) composed of individuals capable of sustaining this elaborate complex

and of handing it on to a capable posterity.

This last consideration is, in fact, the crux of the whole matter; the secret of success, the secret, likewise, of those tragic failures which perplex and sadden the student of history. Man's march athwart the ages has been, not a steady advance, but rather a slow wandering, now breasting sunlit heights, yet anon plunging into dank swamps and gloomy valleys. Of the countless tribes of men, many have perished utterly while others have stopped by the wayside, apparently incapable of going forward, and have either vegetated or sunk into decadence. Man's trail is littered with the wrecks of dead civilizations and dotted with the graves of promising peoples stricken by an untimely end.

Sharp and insistent comes the query: Why? Civilization seems so good a thing! It means relative protection from the blind and cruel forces of nature; abolition of the struggle against savage beasts and amelioration of the struggle between men; opportunity for comfort, leisure, and the development of the higher faculties. Why, then, do we find so many branches of the human species never attaining—never really striving after—these eminently desirable boons? Also (yet more noteworthy!) why do we find still other stocks, after having attained civilization, losing it and falling back to the lower levels of barbarism or even of savagery?

Mysterious though this may at first sight appear, there is, nevertheless, an answer: Those stagnant or decadent peoples could not bear the burden of civilization. For civilization is a burden as well as a benefit. This is inevitable in a universe governed by laws which decree that something may not come out of nothing. Civilization is not a cause but an effect—the effect of sustained human energy; and this energy, in turn, springs from the creative urge of superior germ-plasm. Civilization is thus fundamentally conditioned by race. In any particular people, civilization will progress just so far as that people has the capacity to further it and the ability to bear the correlative burden which it entails. When this crucial point is reached, the civilization of that people either stagnates or retrogrades. Exactly how

the process works becomes clear by a glance at human history.

When the ape-man emerged from utter animality, he emerged with empty hands and an almost empty head. Ever since that far-off day, man has been filling both hands and head—his hands with tools, his head with ideas. But the filling has proceeded most unequally, because capacity has varied greatly among the different branches of mankind. Whether all human varieties spring from a single original stock we do not know. What we do know is that the human species early appears divided into a number of different varieties contrasting markedly both in physical features and mental capacities. Thus differentiated and ever further differentiating, mankind plodded the long, long trail leading from bestiality to savagery, from savagery to barbarism, and from barbarism to civilization. Slowly the empty hands and heads began to fill. The hands grasped chance sticks and stones, then trimmed clubs and chipped flints, then a combination of the twain. These same hands presently fashioned the skins of beasts to clothe the body's nakedness against the cold, kindled fires for warmth and roasted food, modeled clay for pottery, tamed wild creatures into domestic animals. And behind the hand was the brain, not merely making these purely material inventions but also discovering others of a higher order, like speech or even non-material concepts from which sprang the rudiments of social and political existence. All this occurred while man was still a savage. With the next stage—barbarism—came fresh discoveries, like agriculture and the smelting of metals, together with a variety of new ideas (especially the momentous art of writing), which brought mankind to the threshold of civilization.

Now, it is obvious that at this stage of his development man was a vastly different creature from the bestial being of earlier times. Starting from naked destitution and brutish ignorance, man had gradually gathered to himself an increasing mass of tools, possessions, and ideas. This made life much more comfortable and agreeable. But it also made life much more complex. Such a life required vastly more effort, intelligence, and character than had the instinctive, animal existence of primeval days. In other words, long before the dawn of

true civilization, the burden of progress had begun to weigh upon mankind.

Indeed, even the first light burdens had in some cases proved too heavy to be borne. Not all branches of the human species attained the threshold of civilization. Some, indeed, never reached even the limits of savagery. Existing survivals of low-type savage man, such as the Bushmen of South Africa and the Australian "Black-fellows," have vegetated for countless ages in primeval squalor and seem incapable of rising even to the level of barbarism, much less to that of civilization. It is fortunate for the future of mankind that most of these survivals from the remote past are to-day on the verge of extinction. Their persistence and possible incorporation into higher stocks would produce the most depressive and retrogressive results.

Much more serious is the problem presented by those far more numerous stocks, which, while transcending the plane of mere savagery, have stopped at some level of barbarism. Not only have these stocks never originated a civilization themselves, but they seem constitutionally incapable of assimilating the civilization of others. Deceptive veneers of civilization may be acquired, but reversion to congenital barbarism ultimately takes place. To such barbarian stocks belong many of the peoples of Asia, the American Indians, and the African negroes. These congenital barbarians have always been dangerous foes of progress. Many a promising civilization has been ravaged and ruined by barbarians without the wit to rebuild what they had destroyed. To-day, the progress of science may have freed our own civilization from the peril of armed conquest by barbarian hordes; nevertheless, these peoples still threaten us with the subtler menace of "pacific penetration." Usually highly prolific, often endowed with extraordinary physical vigor, and able to migrate easily, owing to modern facilities of transportation, the more backward peoples of the earth tend increasingly to seek the centres of civilization, attracted thither by the high wages and easier living conditions which there prevail. The influx of such lower elements into civilized societies is an unmitigated disaster. It upsets living standards, socially sterilizes the

higher native stocks, and if (as usually happens in the long run) interbreeding occurs, the racial foundations of civilization are undermined, and the mongrelized population, unable to bear the burden, sinks to a lower plane.

So much for savagery and barbarism. Now, what about civilization? For the last eight or ten thousand years civilizations have been appearing all the way from Eastern Asia to Europe and North Africa. At first these civilizations were local—mere points of light in a vast night of barbarism and savagery. They were also isolated; the civilizations of Egypt, Chaldea, India, and China developing separately, with slight influence upon each other. But gradually civilizations spread, met, interacted, synthesized. Finally, in Europe, a great civilizing tide set in, first displaying itself in the "Classic" civilization of Greece and Rome, and persisting down to the "Western Civilization" of our days.

A remarkable fact about civilization is its intensification of features already observed on the savage and barbarian planes. The civilized man has vastly more security, power, opportunity, comfort, leisure, than has the barbarian or savage; he has amassed a wealth of instruments, possessions, and ideas infinitely transcending the paltry hoards of earlier days; he lives in a "man-made" environment astoundingly different from the "state of nature." This is especially true of modern Western civilization. Our civilization may be inferior to others in some respects. It may lack the beauty of the Greek, the durability of the Chinese, the spirituality of the Mediaeval. But in dynamic energy, in mastery over the forces of nature, and in all-round efficiency it far transcends anything the world has ever seen.

In fact, within the past century we have broken the age-old tempo of material progress and have leaped clear over into a new self-made world. Down to a trifle over a century ago, man's material progress had been a gradual—a very gradual—evolution. His tools, though more numerous, were mainly elaborations of those discovered by his remote ancestors. A few instruments like the printing press and the mariner's compass were about the only notable innovations. Man's control over natural resources had likewise not greatly expanded. With the

exception of gunpowder, he had tapped no new sources of material energy since very ancient times. His chief source of power was muscle, animal and human (do we not still reckon in "horse-power"?), and, for the rest, he filled his sails with the breeze and turned clumsy waterwheels by using brooks and streams. But the ancients had done all these things. As for methods of communication, they had, if anything, deteriorated. In the year 1800, there was no system of highways which equalled the Roman roads, no posting-service as quick as Caesar's, no method of signaling which could compare with the semaphore "telegraphy" of the Persians, and probably no ship which could not have been overhauled by a Phoenician galley in a moderate sea.

Suddenly, astoundingly, all was changed. The hidden forces of nature yielded themselves wholesale, as though at the wave of a magician's wand. Steam, electricity, petrol, and a whole series of mysterious "rays" and "waves" gave man powers of which he had not even dreamed. These powers were promptly harnessed to innumerable machines which soon transformed every phase of human existence. Production and transportation were alike revolutionized, distance was well-nigh abolished, and the very planet shrunk to the measure of human hands. In other words, man suddenly entered a new material world, differing not merely in degree but in kind from that of his grandfathers.

Now, all of this inspired modern man with that spirit of confidence and optimistic hope in an illimitably glorious future which characterized the greater part of the nineteenth century. And yet, a little reflection and a modicum of historical knowledge should have made intelligent persons do some hard thinking. Modern civilization was not the first civilization. It was merely the last of a long series of civilizations which had bloomed gloriously—and had then stagnated, decayed, or utterly perished. Furthermore, save for a few exceptional cases where civilizations were uprooted in their prime by a blast of foreign conquest, the basic cause of disaster was always a decline or breakdown from within.

Here, obviously, was food for thought. And, as a matter of fact, a large number of thoughtful persons gave the matter their earnest consideration. Was our glorious modern civilization ultimately destined to be "one with Nineveh or Tyre"? So it might seem: unless, perchance, ours turned out to be the "exception which proves the rule." But what, then, was this "rule" which foredoomed all civilizations to eventual decline? Despite much theorizing, the answers are not convincing. Certain thinkers elaborated "The Law of Civilization and Decay." This fatalistic theory asserted that civilizations, like individuals, have their cycle of youth, maturity, senescence, and death. But what was the cycle? Some civilizations, like those of Egypt and China, endured for thousands of years, others for centuries; still others for a few brief generations. Obviously, no statistical curve could be plotted, and the idea was discredited. Of course, other theories were elaborated. The ruin of civilizations was variously ascribed to luxury, vice, town life, irreligion, and much more besides. Yet all these theories somehow failed to satisfy. They might be shown to have been contributing causes in particular cases, but they could not account universally for the phenomena of declining civilization.

Within the past two decades, however, the rapid progress of biological knowledge has thrown a flood of light on this vexed question, and has enabled us to frame a theory so in accordance with known facts that is seems to offer substantially the correct answer.

And this answer is that, in the last analysis, civilization always depends upon the qualities of the people who are the bearers of it. All these vast accumulations of instruments and ideas, massed and welded into marvelous structures rising harmoniously in glittering majesty, rest upon living foundations—upon the men and women who create and sustain them. So long as those men and women are able to support it, the structure rises, broad-based and serene; but let the living foundations prove unequal to the task, and the mightiest civilization sags, cracks, and at last crashes down into chaotic ruin.

Civilization thus depends absolutely upon the *quality* of its human

supporters. Mere numbers mean nothing. The most brilliant civilization the world has ever seen arose in Athens—a tiny community where the number of freemen (i.e., genuine Athenians) numbered perhaps 50,000 all told. We therefore see that, for civilization to arise at all, a superior human stock is first necessary; while to perfect, or even to maintain that civilization, the human stock must be kept superior. And these are requirements more exacting than might be imagined. Surveying human history, we find that superior stocks are the exception rather than the rule. We have already seen how many races of men have never risen above the planes of savagery or barbarism, while relatively few races have shown the ability to create high and enduring civilizations.

Furthermore, even inside the superior racial groups there exists a similar differentiation. When we speak of a "superior race" we do not imply that all the members of that race stand on the same lofty plane. Of course, the average level runs higher than do the averages of less favored races. But besides this statistical consideration there is the even more important fact that within the higher group itself there exist a relatively large number of very superior individuals, characterized by unusual energy, ability, talent, or genius. It is this elite which leavens the group and initiates progress. Here, again, we see the supreme importance of quality. In no human society has the percentage of really superior individuals even been large—in fact, their percentage has been always statistically negligible. Their influence, however, has been incalculable. Athens was not made up of Platos or Xenophons: it had its quota of dullards, knaves, and fools—as is vividly shown in the immortal satires of Aristophanes. Yet the dynamic power of its elite made Athens the glory of the world, and only when the Athenian stock ceased to produce superiors did Athens sink into insignificance.

Thus we see that civilization depends absolutely upon quality, while quality, in turn, depends upon inheritance. Environment may bring out all there is in a man, but heredity predetermines what there is to bring. We now begin to see the fallacy of such fatalistic notions as

"The Law of Civilization and Decay." Civilizations, unlike living organisms, have no appointed cycle of life and death. Given a high-type stock producing an adequate quota of superior individuals, and a civilization might be immortal.

Why, then, has this never occurred? It has not occurred mainly because of three destructive tendencies which have always, sooner or later, brought civilizations to decline and ruin. These tendencies are: (1) the tendency to structural overloading; (2) the tendency to biological regression; (3) the tendency to atavistic revolt. Here are the three grim Nemeses that have dogged the footsteps of the most promising peoples. Let us consider them in turn.

We have observed how civilizations, as they progress, inevitably become more complex. Each succeeding generation elaborates the social environment of the past, makes fresh additions, and passes on to the next generation, which repeats the process in turn. This ability to transmit social acquirements, both material and mental, is one of the chief points marking man off from the animals. It has, in fact, been happily termed "social heredity." Because of "social heredity" each human generation is able to start at a higher environment level, and is not forced, like the animals, to depend upon instinct and blind experience. Indeed, "social heredity" forms the basis of all those theories which assert that environment is the chief factor in human progress and which minimize true (i.e., biological) heredity as a minor or even negligible factor.

These "environmentalist" arguments, however, omit one essential fact which vitiates their conclusions. This fact is that, while hereditary qualities are implanted in the individual with no action on his part, social acquirements are taken over only at the cost of distinct effort. How great this effort may become is easily seen by the long years of strenuous mental labor required in modern youth to assimilate the knowledge already gained by adults. That old saying, "There is no royal road to learning," illustrates the hard fact that each successive generation must tread the same thorny path if the acquirements of the past are to be retained. Of course, it is obvious that the more

acquirements increase, the longer and steeper the path must be. And this raises the query: May there not come a point where the youthful traveller will be unable to scale the height—where the effort required will be beyond his powers?

Well, this is precisely what has happened numberless times in the past. It is happening to multitudes of individuals about us every day. When it occurs on a sufficiently grand scale we witness those social regressions of entire communities which we call a "decline in civilization." A "decline in civilization" means that the social environment has outrun inherited capacity. Furthermore, the grim frequency of such declines throughout history seems to show that in every highly developed society the increasingly massive, complex superstructure of civilization tends to overload the human foundations.

Now, why does this overloading in high civilizations always tend to take place? For the very simple reason that the complexity (and, therefore, the burden) of a civilization may increase with tremendous rapidity to an inconceivable degree; whereas the capacity of its human bearers remains virtually constant or positively declines.

The sobering truth was until recently obscured by the wide-spread belief (first elaborated about a century ago by the French scientist Lamarck) that acquired characteristics were inherited. In other words, it used to be thought that the acquirements of one generation could be passed on by actual inheritance to the next. Lamarcks's theory excited enthusiastic hopes, and young men contemplating matrimony used to go in for "high thinking" in order to have brainy sons, while expectant mothers inspired their months of gestation by reading the classics, confident that their offspring would be born with a marked taste for good literature. To-day this amiable doctrine is exploded, virtually all biologists now agreeing that acquired characteristics are not inherited.

An abundant weight of evidence proves that, during the entire historic period at any rate, mankind has made no racial progress in either physical power or brain capacity. The skeletal remains of the ancients

show them to have possessed brains and bodies fully equal to our own. And these anatomical observations are confirmed by the teachings of history. The earliest civilized peoples of whom we have any knowledge displayed capacities, initiative, and imagination quite comparable to ours. Of course, their stock of social experience was very much less than ours, but their inherent qualities cannot be deemed inferior. Certainly these ancient peoples produced their full share of great men. Can we show greater philosophers than Plato or Aristotle, greater scientists than Archimedes or Ptolemy, greater generals than Caesar or Alexander, greater poets than Homer or Hesiod, greater spiritual guides than Buddha or Jesus? Surely, the peoples who produced such immortal personalities ranked not beneath us in the biological scale.

But if this is not so; if even the highest human types have made no perceptible biological advance during the last ten thousand years; what does this mean? It means that all the increasingly vast superstructures of civilization which have arisen during those millennia have been raised on similar human foundations. It means that men have been called upon to carry heavier loads with no correlative increase of strength to bear them. The glitter of civilization has so blinded us to the inner truth of things that we have long believed that, as a civilization progressed, the quality of the human stock concerned in building it progressed too. In other words, we have imagined that we saw an improving race, whereas all we actually saw was a race expressing itself under improving conditions.

A dangerous delusion this! Especially for us, whose civilization is the most complex the world has ever seen, and whose burden is, therefore, the heaviest ever borne. If past civilizations have crushed men beneath the load, what may happen to our civilization, and ourselves?

Our analysis has thus far shown that civilizations tend toward structural overloading, both from their own increasing complexity and also from the influence of other civilizations, which add sudden strains and stresses hitherto unknown. Even if this were the only danger to which civilizations were exposed, the matter would be serious enough.

But the problem is more complex. We have already indicated that other destructive tendencies exist. To the second of these tendencies—biological regression—let us now turn.

Up to this point we have viewed civilization mainly in its structural aspect. We have estimated its pressure upon the human foundations, and have provisionally treated these foundations as fixed quantities. But that is only one phase of the problem, because civilization exerts upon its living bearers not merely mechanical, but also vital influences of the profoundest significance. And, unfortunately, these total influences are mainly of a destructive character. The stern truth of the matter is that civilization tends to impair the innate qualities of its human bearers; to use up strong stocks; to unmake those very racial values which first enabled a people to undertake its civilizing task.

Let us see how this comes about.

Consider, first, man's condition before the advent of civilization. Far, far back in its life history the human species underwent a profound differentiation. Fossil bones ten of thousands of years old, show mankind already divided into distinct races differing markedly not merely in bodily structure but also in brain capacity, and hence in intelligence. This differentiation probably began early and proceeded rapidly, since biology teaches us that species are plastic when new, gradually losing this plasticity as they "set" with time and development.

However, at the rate it proceeded, differentiation went on for untold ages, operating not only between separate races but also within the various stocks, so that each stock came to consist of many "strains" varying considerably from one another in both physical and mental capacity.

Now, the fate of these strains depended, not upon chance, but upon the very practical question whether or not they could survive. And since man was then living in the "state of nature," qualities like strength, intelligence, and vigor were absolutely necessary for life, while weakness, dullness, and degeneracy spelled speedy death.

Accordingly, individuals endowed with the former qualities survived and bred freely, whereas those handicapped by the latter qualities perished oftener and left fewer offspring. Thus, age after age, nature imposed upon man her individually stern but racially beneficent will; eliminating the weak, and preserving and multiplying the strong. Surely, it is the most striking proof of human differentiation that races should display such inequalities after undergoing so long a selective process so much the same.

However, differentiated mankind remained, and at last the more gifted races began to create civilizations. Now, civilization wrought profound changes, the most important of which was a modification of the process of selection for survival. So long as man was a savage, or even a barbarian, nature continued to select virtually unhindered according to her immemorial plan—that of eliminating the weak and preserving the strong. But civilization meant a change from a "natural" to a more or less artificial, man-made environment, in which natural selection was increasingly modified by "social" selection. And social selection altered survival values all along the line. In the first place, it enabled many weak, stupid, and degenerate persons to live and beget children who would have certainly perished in the state of nature, or even on the savage and barbarian planes. Upon the strong the effect of social selection was more subtle but equally important. The strong *individual* survived even better than before—*but he tended to have fewer children.*

The reason for this lessened fecundity of the superior was that civilization opened up to them a whole new range of opportunities and responsibilities. Under primitive conditions, opportunities for self-expression were few and simple, the most prized being desirable mates and sturdy offspring. Among savages and barbarians the choicest women and many children are the acknowledged perquisites of the successful, and the successful are those men endowed with qualities like strength, vigor, and resourceful intelligence, which are not only essential for continued survival under primitive conditions, but which are equally essential for the upbuilding and maintenance of

civilization. In short, when a people enters the stage of civilization it is in the pink of condition, because natural selection has for ages been multiplying superior strains and eliminating inferiors.

Such was the high biological level of the selected stocks which attained the plane of civilization. But, as time passed, the situation altered. The successful superiors who stood in the vanguard of progress were alike allured and constrained by a host of novel influences. Power, wealth, luxury, leisure, art, science, learning, government—these and many other matters increasingly complicated life. And, good or bad, temptations or responsibilities, they all had this in common: that they tended to divert human energy from racial ends to individual and social ends.

Now, this diverted energy flowed mainly from the superior strains in the population. Upon the successful superior, civilization laid both her highest gifts and her heaviest burdens. The effect upon the individual was, of course, striking. Powerfully stimulated, he put forth his inherited energies. Glowing with the fire of achievement, he advanced both himself and his civilization. But, in this very fire, he was apt to be racially consumed. Absorbed in personal and social matters, racial matters were neglected. Late marriage, fewer children, and celibacy combined to thin the ranks of the successful, diminish the number of superior strains, and thus gradually impoverish the race.

Meanwhile, as the numbers of the superior diminished, the numbers of the inferior increased. No longer ruthlessly weeded by natural selection, the inferior survived and multiplied.

Here, then, was what had come to pass: instead of dying off at the base and growing at the top, civilized society was dying at the top and spreading out below. The result of this dual process was, of course, as disastrous as it was inevitable. Drained of its superiors, and saturated with dullards and degenerates, the stock could no longer support its civilization. And, the upper layers of the human foundation having withered away, the civilization either sank to a lower level or collapsed in utter ruin. The stock had regressed, “gone back,” and the

civilization went back too.

Such are the workings of that fatal tendency to biological regression which has blighted past civilizations. Its effects on our civilization and the peculiar perils which these entail will be discussed in subsequent chapters. One further point should, however, be here noted. This is the *irreparable* character of racial impoverishment. Once a stock has been thoroughly drained of its superior strains, it sinks into permanent mediocrity, and can never again either create or support a high civilization. Physically, the stock may survive; unfortunately for human progress, it only too often *does* survive, to contaminate better breeds of men. But mentally and spiritually it is played out and can never revive—save, perchance, through some age-long process of biological restoration akin to that seen in the slow reforesting of a mountain range stripped to the bare rock.

We have observed that civilizations tend to fall both by their own increasing weight and by the decay of their human foundations. But we have indicated that there exists yet another destructive tendency, which may be termed "atavistic revolt." Let us see precisely what this implies.

Civilization depends upon superior racial stocks. But stocks are made up of individuals, who, far from being precisely equal, differ widely in qualities and capacities. At one end of the human scale are a number of superior individuals, at the other end a number of inferior individuals, while between the two extremes stands the mass of intermediate individuals, who likewise grade up or down the scale.

Of course, these "superiors," "inferiors," and "intermediates," are not parked off by clear-cut lines; on the contrary, they shade imperceptibly into each other, and between the classes there lie intermediate zones composed of "border-line" individuals whose exact classification is hard to determine. Nevertheless, these classes do exist, just as day and night exist. At dawn or twilight, we cannot say of any particular minute: "This is day, and next minute will be night." Yet day and night are facts of transcendent importance, and we

accordingly grade the hours into categories of light and darkness which, though slightly arbitrary, are essentially true.

Now, among our human categories we have observed that progress is primarily due to the superiors. It is they who found and further civilizations. As for the intermediate mass, it accepts the achievements of its creative pioneers. Its attitude is receptive. This receptivity is due to the fact that most of the intermediate grades are near enough to the superiors to understand and assimilate what the superiors have initiated.

But what about the inferiors? Hitherto we have not analyzed their attitude. We have seen that they are incapable of either creating or furthering civilization, and are thus a negative hindrance to progress. But the inferiors are not mere negative factors in civilized life; they are also positive—in an inverse, destructive sense. The inferior elements are, instinctively or consciously, the enemies of civilization. And they are its enemies, not by chance, but because they are more or less *uncivilizable*. We must remember that the level of society never coincides with the levels of its human units. The social level is a sort of compromise—a balance of constituent forces. This very fact implies that the individuals must be differentially spaced. And so it is. Superior individuals stand above the social level; sometimes far above that level—whence the saying about men "ahead of their times." But what about men "behind their times"? They have always been numerous, and, the higher the civilization, the more of them there are apt to be.

The truth is that as a civilization advances it leaves behind multitudes of human beings who have not the capacity to keep pace. The laggards, of course, vary greatly among themselves. Some are congenital savages or barbarians; men who could not fit into any civilization, and who consequently fall behind from the start. There are not "degenerates"; they are "primitives," carried over into a social environment in which they do not belong. They must be clearly distinguished from the true degenerates: the imbecile, the feeble-minded, the neurotic, the insane—all those melancholy wasteproducts which every living species excretes but which are promptly extirpated

in the state of nature, whereas in human societies they are too often preserved.

Moreover, besides primitives and degenerates, civilization by its very advance automatically condemns fresh multitudes to the ranks of the "inferior." Just as "primitives" who would be quite at home in savage or barbarian environments are alien to any sort of civilization, so, many individuals who rub along well enough in civilization's early phases have neither the wit nor the moral fibre to meet the sterner demands of high, complex civilizations. Most poignant of all is the lot of the "border-liners:—those who *just* fail to achieve a social order, which they can comprehend but in which they somehow cannot succeed.

Such are the ranks of the inferior—the vast army of the unadaptable and the incapable. Let me again emphasize that "inferior" does not necessarily mean "degenerate." The degenerate are, of course, included, but the word "inferior" is a relative term signifying "below" or "beneath," in this case meaning persons beneath or below the standard of civilization. The word inferior has, however, been so often employed as a synonym for degenerate that it tends to produce confusion of thought, and to avoid this I have coined a term which seems to describe collectively all those kinds of persons whom I have just discussed. This term is *The Under-Man*—the man who measures *under* the standards of capacity and adaptability imposed by the social order in which he lives. And this term I shall henceforth employ.

Now, how does the Under-Man look at civilization? This civilization offers him few benefits and fewer hopes. It usually affords him little beyond a meagre subsistence. And, sooner or later, he instinctively senses that he is a failure; that civilization's prizes are not for him. But this civilization, which withholds benefits, does not hesitate to impose burdens. We have previously stated that civilization's heaviest burdens are borne by the superior. Absolutely, this is true; relatively the Under-Man's intrinsically lighter burdens *feel* heavier because of his innate incapacity. The very discipline of the social order oppresses the Under-Man; it thwarts and chastises him at every turn. To wild

natures society is a torment, while the congenital caveman, placed in civilization, is always in trouble and usually in jail.

All this seems inevitable. But, in addition to these social handicaps, the Under-Man often suffers from the action of better-placed individuals who take advantage of his weakness and incapacity to exploit him and drive him down to social levels even lower than those which he would normally occupy.

Such is the Under-Man's unhappy lot. Now, what is his attitude toward that civilization from which he has so little to hope? What but instinctive opposition and discontent? These feelings, of course, vary all the way from dull, unreasoning dislike to flaming hatred and rebellion. But, in the last analysis, they are directed not merely against imperfections in the social order, *but against the social order itself*. This is a point which is rarely mentioned, and still more rarely understood. Yet it is the meat of the whole matter. We must realize clearly that the basic attitude of the Under-Man is an instinctive and natural *revolt against civilization*. The reform of abuses may diminish the intensity of social discontent. It may also diminish the numbers of the discontented, because social abuses precipitate into the depths many persons who do not really belong there; persons who were innately capable of achieving the social order if they had had a fair chance. But, excluding all such anomalous cases, there remains a vast residue of unadaptable, depreciated humanity, essentially uncivilizable and incorrigibly hostile to civilization. Every society engenders within itself hordes of savages and barbarians, ripe for revolt and ever ready to pour forth and destroy.

In normal times these elements of chaos go almost unperceived. Civilization automatically evolves strong social controls which keep down the antisocial elements. For one thing, the civilized man instinctively supports his civilization, just as the Under-Man instinctively opposes it; and when civilization is threatened, its supporters instantly rise in its defense. Again society maintains a permanent standing army (composed of policemen, soldiers, judges, and others), which is usually quite capable of keeping order. The mere

presence of this standing army deters the antisocial elements from mass action. Desperate individuals, of course, break forth into crime, but society hunts them down and eliminates them by prison and the scaffold.

The Under-Man may thus be controlled. But he remains; he multiplies; he bides his time. And, now and then, his time comes. When a civilization falters beneath its own weight and by the decay of its human foundations; when its structure is shaken by the storms of war, dissension, or calamity; then the long-repressed forces of atavistic revolt gather themselves together for a spring.

And (noteworthy fact!) such revolts usually have able leaders. That is what makes them so formidable. This revolutionary officers-corps is mainly composed of three significant types: the "border-liner," the "disinherited," and the "misguided superior." Let us consider them in turn.

We have already noted the "border-liner," the man who cannot *quite* "make good." We have seen how hard is his lot and how hotly he turns against that social order which he just fails to achieve. Most of such persons fail because of some fatal defect—a taint of character or a mental "twist." In other respects they may be very superior, and possess brilliant talents which they can use against society with powerful effect.

We have also noted the "disinherited," the man innately capable of civilized success but cast into the depths by social injustice or individual wrong-doing. Deprived of their birthright, the disinherited are like-wise apt to be bitter foes of society. They enlist gladly in the army of chaos (where they do not really belong), and if they possess marked talents they may be very dangerous enemies.

Lastly, there is the "misguided superior." He is a strange phenomenon! Placed by nature in the van of civilization, he goes over to its enemies. This seems inexplicable. Yet it can be explained. As the Under-Man revolts because civilization is so far ahead of him, so the misguided superior revolts because it is so far behind. Exasperated by its slow

progress, shocked at its faults, and erroneously ascribing to mankind in general his own lofty impulses, the misguided superior dreams short cuts to the millennium and joins the forces of social revolt, not realizing that their ends are profoundly different even though their methods may be somewhat the same. The misguided superior is probably the most pathetic figure in human history. Flattered by designing scoundrels, used to sanctify sinister schemes, and pushed forward as a figurehead during the early stages of revolutionary agitation, the triumph of the revolution brings him to a tragic end. Horrified at sight of barbarism's unmasked face, he tries to stay its destructive course. In vain! The Under-Man turns upon his former champion with a snarl and tramples him into the mud.

The social revolution is now in full swing. Such upheavals are profoundly terrible. I have described them as "atavistic." And that is just what they are—"throw backs" to a far lower social plane. The complex fabric of society, slowly and painfully woven, is torn to tatters; the social controls vanish, and civilization is left naked to the assaults of anarchy. In truth, disruption goes deeper still. Not only is society in the grip of its barbarians, but every individual falls more or less under the sway of his own lower instincts. For, in this respect, the individual is like society. Each of us has within him an "Under-Man," that primitive animality which is the heritage of our human, and even our prehuman, past. This Under-Man may be buried deep in the recesses of our being; but he is there, and psychoanalysis informs us of his latent power. This primitive animality, potentially present even in the noblest natures, continuously dominates the lower social strata, especially the pauper, criminal, and degenerate elements—civilization's "inner barbarians." Now, when society's dregs boil to the top, a similar process takes place in individuals, to whatever social level they may belong. In virtually every member of the community there is a distinct resurgence of the brute and the savage, and the atavistic trend thus becomes practically universal.

This explains most of the seemingly mysterious phenomena of revolution. It accounts for the mental contagion which infects all

classes; the wild elation with which the revolution is at first hailed; the way in which even well-poised men throw themselves into the stream, let it carry them whither it lists, and commit acts which they afterward not only cannot explain but cannot even remember. General atavistic resurgence also accounts for the ferocious temper displayed, not merely by the revolutionists, but by their counter-revolutionary opponents as well. However much they may differ in their principles, "Reds" and "Whites" display the same savage spirit and commit similar cruelties. This is because society and the individual have been alike rebarbarized.

In time the revolutionary tempest passes. Civilized men will not forever endure the misrule of their own barbarians; they will not lastingly tolerate what Burke rightly termed the tyranny of a "base oligarchy." Sooner or later the Under-Man is again mastered, new social controls are forged, and a stable social order is once more established.

But—what sort of social order? It may well be one inferior to the old. Of course, few revolutions are wholly evil. Their very destructiveness implies a sweeping away of old abuses. Yet at what a cost! No other process is so terribly expensive as revolution. Both the social and the human losses are usually appalling, and are frequently irreparable. In his brief hour, the Under-Man does his work. Hating not merely civilization but also the civilized, the Under-Man wreaks his destructive fury on individuals as well as on institutions. And the superior are always his special targets. His philosophy of life is ever a levelling "equality," and he tries to attain it by lopping off all heads which rise conspicuously above his own. The result of this "inverse selection" may be such a decrease of superior persons that the stock is permanently impoverished and cannot produce the talent and energy needed to repair the destruction which the revolutionary cataclysm has wrought. In such cases civilization has suffered a mortal wound and declines to a permanently lower plane.

This is especially true of higher civilizations. The more complex the society and the more differentiated the stock, the graver the liability

to irreparable disaster. Our own civilization is a striking example. The destruction to-day being wrought by the social revolution in Russia, great as it is, would pale beside the far greater destruction which such an upheaval would produce in the more advanced societies of western Europe and America. It would mean nothing short of ruin, and would almost infallibly spell permanent decadence. This grim peril to our civilization and our race future we will carefully examine in subsequent chapters.

So ends our preliminary survey. We have sketched man's ascent from bestiality through savagery and barbarism to civilized life. We have considered the basic reasons for his successes and his failures. Let us now pass to a more detailed examination of the great factors in human progress and decline, with special reference to the possibilities and perils of our own civilization.

CHAPTER II—THE IRON LAW OF INEQUALITY

THE idea of "Natural Equality" is one of the most pernicious delusions that has ever afflicted mankind. It is a figment of the human imagination. Nature knows no equality. The most cursory examination of natural phenomena reveals the presence of a Law of Inequality as universal and inflexible as the Law of Gravitation. The evolution of life is the most striking instance of this fundamental truth. Evolution is a process of differentiation—of increasing differentiation—from the simple one-celled bit of protoplasm to the infinitely differentiated, complex life forms of the present day.

And the evolutionary process is not merely quantitative; it is qualitative as well. These successive differentiations imply increasingly inequalities. Nobody but a madman could seriously contend that the microscopic speck of protoplasmic jelly floating in the tepid waters of the Palaqeozoic Sea was "equal" to a human being.

But this is only the beginning of the story. Not only are the various life types profoundly unequal in qualities and capacities; the individual members of each type are similarly differentiated among themselves. No two individuals are ever precisely alike. We have already seen how

greatly this dual process of differentiation both of type and individual has affected the human species, and how basic a factor it has been in human progress. Furthermore, individual inequalities steadily increase as we ascend the biological scale. The amoeba differs very little from his fellows; the dog much more so; man most of all. And inequalities between men likewise become ever more pronounced. The innate differences between members of a low-grade savage tribe are as nothing compared with the abyss sundering the idiot and the genius who coexist in a high-grade civilization.

Thus, we see that evolution means a process of ever-growing inequality. There is, in fact, no such word as "equality" in nature's lexicon. With an increasingly uneven hand she distributes health, beauty, vigor, intelligence, genius—all the qualities which confer on their possessors superiority over their fellows.

Now, in the face of all this, how has the delusion of "natural equality" obtained—and retained—so stubborn a hold on mankind? As to both its antiquity and persistency there can be no shadow of doubt. The slogan of "equality" was raised far back in the remote past, and, instead of lessening, was never more loudly trumpeted than to-day. It is a curious fact that just when the advance of knowledge and the increasing complexity of civilization have enhanced individual differences and rendered superior capacities supremely important, the cry for equality should have become fiercer than ever, should have been embodied in all sorts of levelling doctrines, and should have been actually attempted in Bolshevik Russia with the most fanactical fury and the most appalling results.

Here is obviously something requiring careful analysis. As a matter of fact, the passion for "natural" equality seems to spring primarily from certain impulses of the *ego,* the self, particularly from the impulses of self-preservation and self-esteem. Every individual is inevitably the centre of *his* world, and instinctively tends to regard his own existence and well-being as matters of supreme importance. This instinctive egoism is, of course, modified by experience, observation, and reflection, and may be so overlaid that it becomes scarcely

recognizable even by the individual himself. Nevertheless, it remains, and subtly colors every thought and attitude. In his heart of hearts, each individual feels that he is really a person of importance. No matter how low may be his capacities, no matter how egregious his failures, no matter how unfavorable the judgement of his fellows; still his inborn instincts of self-preservation and self-love whisper that he should survive and prosper, that "things are not right," and that if the world were properly ordered he would be much better placed.

Fear and wounded vanity thus inspire the individual to resent unfavorable status, and this resentment tends to take the form of protest against "injustice." Injustice of what? Of "fate," "nature," "circumstances," perhaps; yet, more often, injustice of *persons*—individually or collectively (*i.e.*, "society"). But (argues the discontented ego), since all this is unjust, those better placed persons have no "right" to succeed where he fails. Though more fortunate, they are not really his superiors. He is "as good as they are." Hence, either he should be up with them—or they should be down with him. "We are all men. We are all equal!"

Such, in a nutshell, is the train of thought—or rather of *feeling*—underlying the idea of "natural equality." It is, of course, evident that the idea springs primarily from the emotions, however much it may "rationalize" itself by intellectual arguments. Being basically emotional, it is impervious to reason, and when confronted by hard facts it takes refuge in mystic faith. All levelling doctrines (including, of course, the various brands of modern Socialism) are, in the last analysis, not intellectual concepts, but religious cults. This is strikingly shown by recent events. During the past ten years biology and kindred sciences have refuted practically all the intellectual arguments on which the doctrine of "natural equality" relies. But has this destroyed the doctrine? Not at all. Its devoted followers either ignore biology, or elaborate *pseudo*biological fallacies (which we will later examine), or, lastly, lose their tempers, show their teeth, and swear to kill their opponents and get their own way *somehow*—which is just what the extreme "proletarian" ragings mean. Quite useless to point out to such

zealots the inequalities of nature. Their answer is that superior endowment is itself a basic injustice (injustice" of nature!) which it is society's duty to remedy by equalizing rewards regardless of ability or service. This is exemplified by that stock Socialist formula: Distribution according to "needs."

Such are the emotional bases of the doctrine of natural equality. But, as we have already stated, these emotional bases have been buttressed by many intellectual arguments of great apparent force. Indeed, down to our own days, when the *new biological revelation* (for it is nothing short of that) has taught us the supreme importance of heredity, mankind tended to believe that environment rather than heredity was the main factor in human existence. We simply cannot overestimate the change which biology is effecting in our whole outlook on life. It is unquestionably inaugurating the mightiest transformation of ideas that the world has ever seen. Let us glance at the state of human knowledge a few short decades ago to appreciate its full significance.

Down to that time the exact nature of the life process remained a mystery. This mystery has now been cleared up. The researches of Weismann and other modern biologists have revealed the fact that all living beings are due to a continuous stream of *germ-plasm* which has existed ever since life first appeared on earth, and which will continue to exist as long as any life remains. This germ-plasm consists of minute germ-cells which have the power of developing into living beings. All human beings spring from the union of a male sperm-cell and a female egg-cell. Right here, however, occurs the basic feature of the life process. The new individual consists, from the start, of two sorts of plasm. Almost the whole of him is *body*-plasm—the ever multiplying cells which differentiate into the organs of the body. But he also contains *germ*-plasm. At his very conception a tiny bit of the life stuff from which he springs is set aside, is carefully isolated from the body-plasm, and follows a course of development entirely its own. In fact, the germ-plasm is not really part of the individual; he is merely its *bearer,* destined to pass it on to other bearers of the life chain.

Now, all this was not only unknown but even unsuspected down to a very short time ago. Its discovery was in fact dependent upon modern scientific methods. Certainly, it was not likely to suggest itself to even the most philosophic mind. Thus, down to about a generation ago, the life stuff was supposed to be a product of the body, not differing essentially in character from other body products. This assumption had two important consequences. In the first place, it tended to obscure the very concept of heredity, and led men to think of environment as virtually all-important; in the second place, even where the importance of heredity was dimly perceived, the role of the individual was misunderstood, and he was conceived as a creator rather than a mere transmitter. This was the reason for the false theory of the "inheritance of acquired characteristics," formulated by Lamark and upheld by most scientists until almost the end of the nineteenth century. Of course, Lamarkism was merely a modification of the traditional "environmentalist" attitude: it admitted that heredity possessed some importance, but it maintained environment as the basic factor.

Now, a moment's reflection must suggest the tremendous practical differences between the theories of environment and heredity. This is no mere academic matter; it involves a radically different outlook on every phase of life, from religion and government to personal conduct. Let us examine the facts of the case.

Down to our own days mankind had generally believed that environment was the chief factor in existence. This was only natural. The true character of the life process was so closely veiled that it could not well be discovered except by the methods of modern science; the workings of heredity were obscure and easily confounded with environmental influences. The workings of environment, on the other hand, were clear as day and forced themselves on the attention of the dullest observer. To the pressing problems of environment, therefore, man devoted himself, seeking in the control of his surroundings both the betterment of the race and the curing of its ills. Only occasionally did a few reflective minds catch a glimpse of the

heredity factor in the problem of life. That marvellous breed of men, the ancient Greeks, had such glimpses of the higher truth. With their characteristic insight they discerned clearly the principle of heredity, gave considerable thought to it, and actually evolved a theory of race-betterment by the weeding out of inferior strains and the multiplication of superiors—in other words, the "Eugenics" theory of to-day.

For example, as early as the sixth century B.C. the Greek poet Theognis of Megara wrote: "We look for rams and asses and stallions of good stock, and one believes that good will come from good; yet a good man minds not to wed the evil daughter of an evil sire. … Marvel not that the stock of our folk is tarnished, for the good is mingling with the base." A century later Plato was as much interested in biological selection as the best method for race improvement. He suggested that the state should mate the best with the best and the worst with the worst; the former should be encouraged to breed freely, while the offspring of the unfit should be destroyed. Aristotle likewise held that the state should strongly encourage the increase of superior types.

Of course, these were but the visions of a few seers, which had no practical results. The same is true of those other rare thinkers who, like Shakespeare with his famous lines about "nature" and "nurture," evidently grasped the hereditarian idea. The mass of mankind continued to hold that environment was the great matter for consideration.

Now, a belief in the transcendent importance of environment leads inevitably to certain conclusions of great practical importance. In the first place, if it be true that man is moulded primarily by his environment, it logically follows that he has merely to gain control over his environment in order to change himself almost at will. Therefore, according to the environmentalist, progress depends, not on human nature, but on conditions and institutions. Again, if man is the product of his environment, human differences are merely effects of environmental differences, and can be rapidly modified by environmental changes. Lastly, before the supreme importance of

environment, all human differences whether individual or racial sink into insignificance, and all men are potentially "equal."

Such are the logical deductions from the environmentalist theory. And this theory was certainly attractive. It not only appealed to those wounded feelings of self-preservation and self-esteem among the ill-endowed and the unfortunate which we have previously examined, but it appealed also to many of the most superior minds of the race. What could be more attractive than the thought that humanity's ills were due, not to inborn shortcomings, but to faulty surroundings, and that the most backward and degraded human beings might possibly be raised to the highest levels if only the environment were sufficiently improved? This appeal to altruism was powerfully strengthened by the Christian doctrine of the equality of all souls before God. What wonder, then, that philosophers and scientists combined to elaborate theories about mankind of a wholly environmentalist character?

All the greatest thinkers of the eighteenth century (who still influence our ideas and institutions to a far greater degree than we may imagine) were convinced believers in "natural equality." Locke and Hume, for example, taught that at birth "the human mind is a blank sheet, and the brain a structureless mass, lacking inherent organization or tendencies to develop in this way or that; a mere mass of undefined potentialities which, through experience, association and habit, through education, in short, could be molded and developed to an unlimited extent and in any manner or direction." The doctrine of natural equality was brilliantly formulated by Rousseau, and was explicitly stated both in the American Declaration of Independence and in the French Declaration of the Rights of Man. The doctrine, in its most uncompromising form, held its ground until well past the middle of the nineteenth century. At that period so notable a thinker as John Stuart Mill could declare roundly: "Of all vulgar modes of escaping from the consideration of the effect of social and moral influences on the human mind, the most vulgar is that of attributing the diversities of conduct and character to inherent natural differences."

Mill's utterance may be considered an expression of pure

environmentalism. At the moment when he spoke, however, the doctrine had already been considerably modified. In fact, by the beginning of the nineteenth century, the progress of science had begun to lift the veil which obscured the mystery of heredity, and scientists were commencing to give close attention to such matters. At first the phenomena of inheritance were not believed to effect the basic importance of environment. This idea was clearly stated early in the nineteenth century by the French naturalist Lamarck. Lamarck asserted that the forms and functions of living beings arose and developed through use, and that such changes were directly transmitted from generation to generation. In other words, Lamarck formulated the theory of the "inheritance of acquired characteristics" which was destined to dominate biological thinking down to a generation ago. This theory, which is usually termed "Lamarckism," was merely a modification of the old environmentalist philosophy. It admitted the factor of heredity, but it considered heredity dependent upon environmental influences.

It is difficult to overestimate the tremendous practical consequences of Lamarkism, not merely upon the nineteenth century but also upon our times. the primal importance of heredity may to-day be accepted by most scientists and by an increasing number of forward-looking persons everywhere, but it has as yet neither deeply penetrated the popular consciousness nor sensibly modified our institutions. The march of new ideas is slow at best, and however much we may be changing our thinking, we are still living and acting under the environmentalist theories of the past. Our political, educational, and social systems remain alike rooted in Lamarckism and proceed on the basic premise that environment rather than heredity is the chief factor in human existence.

The emotional grip of Lamarckism is very strong. It is an optimistic creed, appealing to both the hopes and sympathies. To Lamarckism was due in large measure the cheery self-confidence of the nineteenth century, with its assurance of automatic and illimitable progress. Indeed, in some respects, Lamarckism increased rather than

diminished the traditional faith in environment. Before Lamarck, men had believed that the new-born individual was a blank sheet on which society could write. Now came Lamarck, asserting that much of this writing could be passed on by inheritance to succeeding generations with cumulative effect. Considering the powerful agencies which society had at its disposal—government, the church, the home, the school, philanthropy, etc. it was easy to believe that a wiser and intenser application of these social agencies offered a sure and speedy road to the millennium.

Accordingly, "the comfortable and optimistic doctrine was preached that we had only to improve one generation by more healthy surroundings, or by better education, and, by the mere action of heredity, the next generation would begin on a higher level of natural endowments than its predecessor. And so, from generation to generation, on this theory, we could hope continually to raise the inborn character of a race in an unlimited progress of cumulative improvement."

On this common environmentalist basis all the political and social philosophies of the nineteenth century arose.

They might differ widely and wrangle bitterly over which environmental factor was of prime importance. Political thinkers asserted that progress depended on constitutions; "naturalists" like Buckle claimed that peoples were moulded by their physical environments like so much soft clay; while Socialists proclaimed that man's regeneration lay in a new system of economics. Nevertheless, they were all united by a common belief in the supreme importance of environment, and they all either ignored heredity or deemed it a minor factor.

We need to stress this point, because we must remember that it is precisely these doctrines which still sway the thought and action of most persons—even the educated. "Whether they know it or not, most people who have not made a particular study of the question still tacitly assume that the acquirements of one generation form part of

the inborn heritage of the next, and the present social and educational systems are founded in large part on this false foundation."

Let us now consider the rise of the new biology, which has already exerted so powerful an influence upon our philosophy of life and which promises to affect profoundly the destines of mankind. Modern biology can be said to date from the publication of Darwin's work on *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection,* in the year 1859. This epoch-making book was fiercely challenged and was not generally accepted even by the scientific world until the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Its acceptance, however, marked nothing short of a revolution in the realm of ideas. Darwin established the principle of *evolution* and showed that evolution preceeded by *heredity.* A second great step was soon taken by Francis Galton, the founder of the science of "Eugenics" or "Race Betterment." Darwin had centred his attention on animals. Galton applied Darwin's teaching to man, and went on to break new ground by pointing out not merely the inborn differences between men, but the fact that these differences could be controlled; that the human stock could be surely and lastingly improved by increasing the number of individuals endowed with superior qualities and decreasing the number of inferiors. In other words, Galton grapsed fully the momentous implications of heredity (which Darwin had not done), and announced clearly that heredity rather than environment was the basic factor in life and the prime lever of human progress.

Like most intellectual pioneers, Galton had to wait long for adequate recognition. Although his first eugenic writings appeared as early as 1865, they did not attract a tithe of the attention excited by Darwin's work, and it was not until the very close of the nineteenth century that his theory gained wide acceptance even in scientific circles, while the educated public did not become really aware of it until the opening years of the present century. Once fairly started, however, the idea made rapid progress. In every part of the civilized world scientists took up the work, and soon a series of remarkable discoveries by biologists like Weismann, DeVries, and others put the new science on a

sure and authoritative foundation.

We have already indicated how momentous has been the change in outlook wrought by the new biological revelation, not merely in the field of abstract science, but also in every phase of practical human existence. The discovery of the true nature of the life process, the certainty that the vast inequalities among men are due primarily to heredity rather than environment, and the discovery of a scientific method of race improvement, are matters of transcendent importance. Let us examine some of their practical aspects.

One of the most striking features of the life process is the tremendous *power* of heredity. The marvellous potency of the germ-plasm is increasingly revealed by each fresh biological discovery. Carefully isolated and protected against external influences, the germ-plasm persistently follows its predetermined course, and even when actually interfered with it tends to overcome the difficulty and resume its normal evolution.

This persistency of the germ-plasm is seen at every stage of its development, from the isolated germ-cell to the mature individual. Consider it first at its earliest stage. Ten years ago biologists generally believed that the germ-plasm was permanently injured—and permanently modified—by certain chemical substances and disease toxins like lead, alcohol, syphilis, etc. These noxious influences were termed "racial poisons," and were believed to be prime causes of racial degeneracy. In other words, here was a field where biologists used to admit that environment *directly* modified heredity in profound and lasting fashion. To-day the weight of evidence is clearly the other way. While it is still generally admitted that injury to the germ-plasm does occur, most biologists now think that such injury is a *temporary "induction,"* that is, a change in the germ-cells which does not permanently alter the nature of the inherited traits and which will disappear in a few generations if the injury be not repeated.

To quote from an authoritative source: "We are thus in a position to state that, from the engenist's point of view, the *origination* of

degeneracy, by some direct action on the germ-plasm, is a contingency that hardly needs to be reckoned with. … The germ-plasm is so carefully isolated and guarded that it is almost impossible to injure it, except by treatment so severe as to kill it altogether; and the degeneracy with which the eugenists are called on to deal is a degeneracy which is running along from generation to generation and which, when once stopped by the cessation of reproduction, is in little danger of being originated anew through some racial poison."

Consider now the life process at its next stage—the stage between conception and birth. It used to be thought that the germ-plasm of the growing embryo could be injured and permanently altered, not merely by the "racial poisons" above mentioned but also by certain "prenatal" influences, such as the mother's undernourishment, chronic exhaustion, fright, worry, or shock. Today such ideas are utterly discredited. There is not a shred of evidence that the mother's circumstances or feelings can affect in any way the *germ*-plasm of her unborn child. Of course, the mother's condition may profoundly affect the embryo's *body*-plasm, so that the child may be been stunted or diseased. But the child will not pass on those handicaps by heredity to its offspring. Conversely, it is equally certain that nothing the mother can do to improve her unborn child will better its germ-plasm. She may give her child a sounder body, but its heredity was fixed irrevocably the instant it was conceived. Here, then, is another field where the theory of direct action of environment on heredity has been definitely disproved.

Let us pass to the next stage. Birth has taken place. The individual is out in the world and is exposed to environmental influences vastly greater than those which acted upon him during his embryonic stage. But these environmental influences fall upon his *body*-plasm; his *germ*-plasm is as carefully isolated and protected as was his parents', so that the same laws which we have already discussed will apply to him as well as to them.

Furthermore, the effect of the environment even upon the body-plasm will depend largely upon what sort of a creature the particular

individual may be. Biology has recently discovered that the effect of environment decreases as we ascend the life scale; in other words, the simpler types are most affected, while man, the highest biological type, seems to be affected least of all. This is a point of great importance. Certain environmentalist writers have maintained that, even though the germ-plasm were unaltered, man is so moulded by his environment that with each generation the hereditary tendencies are overcome by circumstances and are thus rendered *practically* of secondary importance. Such writers base their arguments largely upon scientific experiments made upon primitive forms of animal life, where striking bodily changes have been brought about. As applied to man, however, these arguments are misleading, because the same influences which profoundly affect lower forms have relatively little effect upon the higher animals and still less upon man himself. Man is, therefore, least affected by, and most independent of, environmental influences. This matter has been ably summed up by the American biologist Woods, who has formulated it as "The Law of Diminishing Environmental Influences." Woods shows not only that environmental influence diminishes according to the individual's rank in the biological scale, but also that, even within the body of the particular individual, environmental influence diminishes with the evolutionary rank of the tissue affected and in proportion to its age. This is important in connection with possible environmental influence upon the human brain. Says Woods: "It must be remembered that the brain-cells, even of a child, are, of all tissues, farthest removed from any of these primordial states. The cells of the brain ceased subdivision long before birth. Therefore, *a priori,* we must expect relatively little modification of brain function. Finally, Woods shows that environmental influence diminishes with the organism's power of choice. This is, of course, of the utmost importance regarding man. For, as Woods says: "This may be the chief reason why human beings, who of all creatures have the greatest power to choose the surroundings congenial to their special needs and natures, are so little affected by outward conditions. The occasional able, ambitious, and determined member of an obscure or degenerate family *can* get free from his uncongenial associates. So can

the weak or lazy or vicious (even if a black sheep from the finest fold) easily find his natural haunts."

From all this Woods concludes: "Experimentally and statistically, there is not a grain of proof that ordinary environment can alter the salient mental and moral traits in any measurable degree from what they were predetermined to be through innate influences."

We thus see that man is moulded more by heredity and less by environment than any other living creature, and that the vast differences observable between human beings are mainly predetermined at the instant of conception, with relatively little regard to what happens afterward.

Let us now observe some of the actual workings of heredity in man, both in the good and bad sense. In the present chapter we will devote our attention mainly to the superior types, leaving our consideration of the inferior for the next chapter.

Now, what do we know about superior individuals? We know that they exist and that they are due to heredity. That is a good beginning, but it would not get us very far unless we knew more along the same lines. Fortunately, we not only know that superiors tend to produce superior offspring, but that they produce such offspring according to natural laws which can be determined statistically with a high degree of accuracy. (And, of course, the same is true of the production of inferiors.)

The production of superior persons has been studied by modern biologists from Galton down to the present day, and a mass of authoritative data has been accumulated. Let us examine a few of these instructive investigations. To cite the earliest of them, Galton's study on "Hereditary Genius" (1869), Galton discovered that in English history, success in life was a strikingly "family affair." From careful statistical investigation of a great number of notable Englishmen Galton found that a distinguished father was infinitely more likely to have a distinguished son than was an undistinguished father. To cite one case out of many, Galton found that the son of a distinguished

judge had about one chance in four of becoming himself distinguished, while the son of a man picked out at random from the general population had only about one chance in 4,000 of becoming similarly distinguished.

Of course, the objection at once suggested itself that environmental influences like social opportunity might be predominant; that the son of a distinguished man is pushed forward regardless of his innate abilities, while the son of an obscure man never gets a chance. To test this, Galton turned to the history of the Papacy. For centuries it was the custom for a Pope to adopt one of his nephews as a son, and advance him in every way. Now, if opportunity is all that is necessary to advance a man, these adopted sons ought to have reached eminence in the same proportion as the real sons of eminent men. As a matter of fact, however, they reached eminence only as often as the statistical expectation for nephews of great men—whose chance of eminence has been discovered to be much less than that of the sons of great men. Nevertheless, despite different ratios of heritability, superiority still remains a family affair; Galton found that nearly half of the great men of England had distinguished close relatives.

Galton's studies of English greatness have been criticised as applying to a country where caste lines are sharply drawn. To test these objections the American biologist Woods transferred the inquiry to the United States—a land where opportunities have been much more equal and rigid caste lines virtually absent. How was it with the great men of America? If they were found to have fewer distinguished relatives than the great men of England, it would be a great feather in the environmentalists' cap, since it would tend to show that, given equal opportunity, success does not depend on family stock. On the other hand, if what was true of England should hold good also of America, the theory of hereditary superiority would be much more firmly established. The result of Woods's study was a striking confirmation of Galton's researches. Woods took two groups of distinguished Americans; a large group of 3,500 listed as eminent in the standard dictionaries of biography; and a small group of the 46 very eminent

Americans admitted to the "Hall of Fame." Now, how were these eminent persons related to each other? If superiority did not "run in families," it is evident that their chances of relationship would be no greater than that of the rest of the population—which ratio Woods found to be statistically 1 in 500. However, as a matter of fact, the 3,500 eminent Americans were found to be related to each other, not as 1 to 500 but as 1 to 5. Furthermore, by picking out the more eminent among the 3,500 and forming a new group, this group was found to be related to each other as 1 to 3. Most striking of all were the results obtained by considering the very superior group listed in the Hall of Fame. Here the ratio of relationship rose to 1 in 2, while if all their eminent relations were counted in, they averaged more than one a piece. Thus, distinguished Americans are discovered to be from 500 to 1,000 times as much related to other distinguished persons as is the ordinary American. Or, to put it in another way, something like 1 per cent of the population of the United States is as likely to produce a genius as is all the rest of the country put together—the other 99 cent.

It might, to be sure, be objected that even in America the early environment of eminent men might be on the average more favorable than that of the mass of the population. This objection is met by another of Woods's investigation—a very able and elaborate study of the royal families of Europe. Here is a class of persons where no one can doubt that the environment is uniformly favorable. If opportunity rather than inherited capacity be the cause of success, then most of the members of this class ought to have succeeded, and succeeded in about the same degree, because to every one of royal blood the door of opportunity stands open. Yet the result of Woods's study was just the reverse of this. Despite the good environment almost uniformly present, superiority in royalty, as in other classes, is found to be a distinctly "family matter." Royal geniuses are not scattered haphazard over the genealogical chart; they are concentrated in isolated chains of closely related individuals. One chain centres in Frederick the Great, another in Queen Isabella of Spain, a third in William the Silent, and a fourth in Gustavus Adolphus. And, be it also noted, inferiority in

royalty is equally segregated, royal dullards and degenerates also running by families.

But how about superior individuals who rise from apparently mediocre stocks? Environmentalist writers are forever compiling lists of great men who "came from nothing." These cases have, however, been carefully investigated, and the more they are studied the more convincing grows the evidence that greatness never arises out of "nothing." Take Abraham Lincoln. He was long a shining example for the environmentalist thesis. Lincoln is popularly supposed to have come from "poor white trash" of a very inferior order. But careful investigation proves that this is emphatically not so. As one of the investigators remarks: "So far from his later career being unaccounted for in his origin and early history, it is as fully accounted for as is the case of any man." And a recent authority goes on to state: "The Lincoln family was one of the best in America, and while Abraham's own father was an eccentric person, he was yet a man of considerable force of character, by no means the 'poor white trash,' which he is often represented to have been. The Hanks family, to which the Emancipator's mother belonged, had also maintained a high level of ability in every generation. Furthermore, Thomas Lincoln and Nancy Hanks, the parents of Abraham Lincoln, were first cousins."

Of course, there are a considerable number of distinguished individuals whose greatness genealogy cannot as yet explain. But in most cases this is because very little is discoverable about their ancestors. Furthermore, as Holmes justly remarks: "It should be borne in mind that greatness involves a peculiar complex of qualities the lack of any one of which may prevent an individual from achieving an eminent position. A great man has to do more than simply exist; he must accomplish labors of a particularly noteworthy kind before he is crowned with fame, and many a man of splendid natural endowments has fallen short of achieving greatness through some inherent weakness of character or the lack of sufficient inspiration or driving force. Great men not only have to be born great; they also have to achieve greatness, and if they receive their proper recognition in the

eyes of the world, greatness has to be thrust upon them besides. Great men, it is true, *seem* to rise higher than their source. Generally they come from an ancestry considerably above mediocrity. And I venture to express the opinion that a great man has never been produced from parents of subnormal mentality. A great man is more apt to arise if both parents are of very superior ability than if only one parent is above mediocrity. Where the great man appears to stand far above the level of his immediate ancestors it is due in large part, I believe, to the fact that each parent supplied peculiar qualities lacking in the other, assisted also by qualities from more remote ancestors which may have conspired to furnish the necessary complement of hereditary factors. … One thing is certain, and that is that you cannot make greatness out of mediocrity or good ability out of inborn dullness by all the aids which environment and education or anything else can possibly offer."

Indeed, even if we admit that great men may occasionally arise from stocks which had never shown any signs of superiority, this ought to strengthen rather than weaken our belief in the force of heredity. As Woods well says, when it is considered how rarely such an ancestry produces a great man, it must be evident that his greatness is due to an accidental conjunction of favorable traits converging through his parents and meeting in himself.

Finally, how except by heredity can we explain the enormous differences in achievement between great numbers of persons exposed to the same environment and enjoying similar opportunities? "In terms of environment, the opportunity to become a great physicist was open to every one of the thousands of university students who were the contemporaries of Lord Kelvin; the opportunity to become a great musician has been open to all the pupils in all the conservatories of music which have flourished since Johann Sebastian Bach was a choirboy at Luneburg; the opportunity to become a multimillionaire has been open to every clerk who has wielded a pen since John D. Rockefeller was a bookkeeper in a Cleveland store; the opportunity to become a great merchant has been open to every boy who has

attended an American public school since the time when John Wanamaker, at fourteen years of age, was an errand boy in a Philadelphia book store."

Such are the investigations of biology concerning human inequalities. They are certainly striking, and they all point to the same conclusions, namely: that such inequalities are inborn; that they are predetermined by heredity; and that they are not inherently modified by either environment or opportunity.

But this is only half the story. Within the past twenty years the problem of human inequality has been approached along a wholly new line, by a different branch of science—psychology. And the findings of these psychological investigations have not only tallied with those of biology in further revealing the inherited nature of human capacities, but have also proved it in even more striking fashion and with far greater possibilities of practical application.

The novelty of the psychological approach to the problem is evident when we realize that, whereas biology has been investigating mainly the individual's ancestry or actions, psychology examines the mind itself. The best-known instruments of psychological investigation are the so-called "Intelligence Tests," first invented by the French psychologist Binet in the year 1905. From Binet's relatively modest beginning the mental tests have increased enormously in both complexity and scope, culminating in three gigantic investigations conducted by the American army authorities during the late war, when more than 1,700,000 men were mentally tested in a variety of ways. Furthermore, despite the notable progress which it has already made, the psychological method appears to be still in its infancy, and seems likely to yield far more extraordinary results in the near future. Yet the results already attained are of profound significance. It has been conclusively proved that intelligence is predetermined by heredity; that individuals come into the world differing vastly in mental capacities; that such differences remain virtually constant throughout life and cannot be lessened by environment or education; that the present mental level of any individual can be definitely ascertained,

and even a child's future adult mental level confidently predicted. These are surely discoveries whose practical importance can hardly be overestimated. They enable us to grade not merely individuals but whole nations and races according to their inborn capacities, to take stock of our mental assets and liabilities, and to get a definite idea as to whether humanity is headed toward greater achievement or toward decline.

Let us now see precisely what the intelligence tests have revealed. In the first place, we must remember the true meaning of the word "intelligence." "Intelligence" must not be confused with "knowledge." Knowledge is the result of intelligence, to which it stands in the relation of effect to cause. Intelligence is the capacity of the mind; knowledge is the raw material which is put into the mind. Whether the knowledge is assimilated or lost, or just what use is made of it, depends primarily upon the degree of intelligence. This intellectual capacity as revealed by mental testing is termed by psychologists the "I. Q." or "intelligence quotient."

Psychology has invented a series of mental yardsticks for the measurement of human intelligence, beginning with the mind of the child. For example, the mental capacity of a child at a certain age can be ascertained by comparing it (as revealed by mental tests) with the intelligence which careful examination of a vast number of cases has shown to be the statistical average for children of that age. This is possible because it has been found that mental capacity increases regularly as a child grows older. This increase is rapid during the first years of life, then slows down until, about the age of sixteen, there is usually no further growth of mental capacity—albeit exceptionally superior intellects continue to grow in capacity for several years thereafter.

A large number of careful investigations made among school children have revealed literally amazing discrepancies between their chronological and their mental ages. In classes of first grade grammar-school children, where the chronological age is about six years, some pupils are found with mental ages as low as three while other pupils

are found with mental ages as high as nine or ten. Similarly, in first year high-school classes, where the chronological age is about fourteen years, the mental age of some pupils may rank as low as ten or eleven, while the mental age of others may rise as high as nineteen or twenty.

And, be it remembered, the "I. Q." of any individual child, once discovered, can be counted on as a *constant* factor, which does not change with the lapse of time. For example: Take two children rated by their birth certificates as being both four years old, but with mental ages of three and five respectively. When they are chronologically eight years old, the mental age of the duller child will be about six, while the mental age of the brighter child will be about ten. And when they an chronologically twelve years old, their respective mental ages will be approximately nine and fifteen. Assuming that growth of mental capacity stops in both children at the chronological age of sixteen, the ratio of their mental ages as then attained will remain constant between them all the rest of their lives. That is why the mental ages of persons over sixteen, once ascertained, can be regarded as fixed quantities. The only exceptions are those comparatively rare individuals of very superior mentality whose intelligence continues to grow a few years longer, and who are consequently very far in advance of their fellows. Two methods of mental grading are employed: children are graded according to "years"; adults are graded according to qualitative ratings ranging from "very superior," through "average," to "very inferior."

Space forbids any detailed discussion of the actual make-up of mental tests. Their number is legion and their specialization is minute. Yet they all yield the same general results. "No matter what trait of the individual be chosen, results are analogous. If one takes the simplest traits, to eliminate the most chances for confusion, one finds the same conditions every time. Whether it be speed in marking off all the A's in a printed sheet of capitals, or in putting together the pieces of a puzzle, or in giving a reaction to some certain stimulus or in making associations between ideas, or drawing figures, or memory for various things, or giving the opposites of words, or discrimination of lifted

weights, or success in any one of hundreds of other mental tests, the conclusion is the same. There are wide differences in the abilities of individuals, no two being alike, either mentally or physically, at birth or any time thereafter."

We thus see that human beings are spaced on widely different mental levels; that they have a variety of mental statures, just as they have a variety of physical statures, and that both are basically due to inheritance. Furthermore, it is extremely significant to observe how closely intelligence is correlated with industrial or professional occupation, social and economic status, and racial origin. Nowhere does the power of heredity show forth more clearly than in the way innate superiority tends to be related to actual achievement. Despite the fact that our social system contains many defects which handicap superior individuals and foster inferiors; despite the fact that our ideas, laws, and institutions are largely based on the fallacies of environmentalism and "natural equality"; nevertheless, the imperious urge of superior germ-plasm beats against these man-made barriers and tends to raise the superior individuals who bear it—albeit only too often at the cost of their racial sterility through their failure to leave children.

Another noteworthy point is the way psychology has confirmed biological and sociological theories. Both biologists and sociologists have long been coming more and more to regard social and racial status as valid indications of innate quality. Now comes psychology, approaching the problem from a new angle and with different methods, and its findings coincide closely with those which the other sciences have already made. How close is this coincidence a few examples will show.

Taking first a couple of English researches: a comparison was made of the intellectual capacity of the boys at a certain private school who were mostly the sons of Oxford "dons" (*i.e.*, members of the university faculty) and the capacity of the boys at a municipal school attended by boys from the town population. I will quote the results in the words of Professor McDougall, who supervised the experiment, and of Mr. H.

B. English, who conducted it. Says Professor McDougall: “The municipal school was an exceptionally good school of its kind, the teaching being in many respects better than in the other—the private school; the boys were from good homes, sons of good plain citizens—shopkeepers and skilled artisans, and so forth. Without going into detail I may say, summarily, that the result was to show a very marked superiority of the boys of the school frequented by the intellectual class.” And Mr. English states: “Although the groups are small, they are exceedingly homogeneous and thoroughly representative of the children in two social or economic strata. The writer does not hesitate, therefore, to predicate these results for the children of the entire classes represented or to conclude that the children of the professional class exhibit between twelve and fourteen years of age a very marked superiority in intelligence.” And Professor McDougall adds the following interesting comment: “The result is all the more striking, if you reflect on the following facts: First, every boy has two parents and inherits his qualities from both. Secondly, it has not been shown that university dons prefer clever wives, or that they are particularly clever in choosing clever wives. It remains, then, highly probable that, if the wives of these men were all as superior in respect of intellect as their husbands, the superiority of their sons to the boys of the other group would have been still more marked.”

In this connection, let me quote the conclusions of another British psychologist who made a similar experiment with like results: “For all these reasons we may conclude that the superior proficiency at intelligence tests on the part of boys of superior parentage was inborn. And thus we seem to have proved marked inheritability in the case of a mental character of the highest ‘civic worth.’”

Let us now pass to America. The United States offers a more instructive field, because, with its more fluid social structure and its heterogeneous racial makeup, the correlations between intelligence, social or economic status, and racial origin can be studied simultaneously.

Before discussing these American experiments, let us recall certain

facts. For a long time past American biologists and sociologists have been coming more and more to the following conclusions: (1) That the old “Native American” stock, favorably selected as it was from the races of northern Europe, is the most superior element in the American population; (2) that subsequent immigrants from northern Europe, though coming from substantially the same racial stocks, were less favorably selected and average somewhat less superior; (3) that the more recent immigrants from southern and eastern Europe average decidedly inferior to the north European elements; (4) that the negroes are inferior to all other elements. Now, let us see how psychological tests have confirmed these biological and sociological conclusions.

One of the most recent of these experiments was that conducted upon several hundred school children in the primary grades. The children were classified in two ways: according to racial origin, and according to economical status of parents. The racial classifications were: (a) children of American-born white parents; (b) children of Italian immigrants (mostly south Italians); (c) colored (negroes and mulattoes). The economic-social classifications of parents were: (1) professional; (2) semi-professional and higher business; (3) skilled labor; (4) semiskilled and unskilled labor. The “I. Q.” (intelligence quotient) of each category was then obtained, the object being to discover what correlations (if any) existed between racial origin, economic-social status, and intelligence. Here are the results:

Americans of social status (1) I.Q. = 125

" " " " (2) I.Q. = 118

" " " " (3) I.Q. = 107

" " " " (4) I.Q. = 92

All Americans grouped together I.Q. = 106

Italian I.Q. = 84

Colored I.Q. = 83

A similar experiment made on children in New York City public schools

by the well-known authority, Professor S. M. Terman, yields strikingly similar results. In this case the children were graded simply according to racial origin of parents, the classifications being: (1) Parents native-born white Americans; (2) parents north European immigrants; (3) parents Italian immigrants; (4) parents Portuguese immigrants. Here are the results:

American I.Q = 100

North European I.Q = 105

Italian I.Q = 84

Portuguese I.Q = 84

Note how the respective I.Q.'s of both the American and the Italian groups are identical in both experiments, although the children examined were, of course, not the same.

Here are the conclusions of Professor Terman regarding the correlation between economic-social status of parents and intelligence in children, as a result of his many researches upon school children from New York to California: "Intelligence of 110 to 120 I. Q. (this range is defined as 'Superior intelligence') is approximately five times as common among children of superior social status as among children of inferior social status, the proportion among the former being about 24 per cent of all and among the latter only 5 per cent of all. The group of 'superior intelligence,' is made up largely of children of the fairly successful mercantile or professional classes." Professor Terman defined as of "very superior intelligence" those children who scored in the tests more than 120 marks. "Children of this group are," he says, "unusually superior. Not more than 3 out of 100 go as high as 125 I.Q., and only about 1 out of 100 as high as 130 I. Q. In the schools of a city of average population only about 1 child in 250 or 300 tests as high as 140 I.Q. In a series of 476 unselected children there was not a single one reaching 120 I. Q. whose social class was described as 'below average.' Of the children of superior social status, about 10 per cent reached 120 I.Q. or better. The 120-140 group (i.e., of very superior intelligence) is made up almost entirely of children whose parents

belong to the professional or very successful business classes. The child of a skilled laborer belongs here occasionally; the child of a common laborer very rarely indeed." Finally, let us note, in passing, some of the numerous researches which have been made on the intelligence of colored school children. Space forbids our going into this point. Suffice it to say that the results accord with what has been previously stated, namely: that the intelligence of the colored population averages distinctly lower than the intelligence of native American whites, and somewhat lower than the intelligence of our least promising east and south European elements.

So much for experiments upon children. Now, let us consider similar psychological investigations of the intelligence of adults. Fortunately, we possess a great mass of valuable data from the mammoth investigations conducted by the United States army authorities upon more than 1,700,000 officers and men during the late war. These investigations were planned and directed by a board of eminent psychologists. It is interesting to note that they were inspired, not by abstract scientific motives, but by motives of practical efficiency. In the words of two leading members of the investigating board, Majors Yoakum and Yerkes:

> "The human factors in most practical situations have been neglected largely because of our consciousness of ignorance and our inability to control them. Whereas engineers deal constantly with physical problems of quality, capacity, stress and strain, they have tended to think of problems of human conduct and experience either as unsolved or as insoluble. At the same time there has existed a growing consciousness of the practical significance of these human factors and of the importance of such systematic research as shall extend our knowledge of them and increase our directive power.
>
> The great war from which we are now emerging into a civilization in many respects now has already worked marvellous changes in our points of view, our expectations, and practical demands. Relatively early in this supreme struggle, it became clear to

> certain individuals that the proper utilization of man-power, and more particularly of mind or brain-power, would assure ultimate victory… All this had to be done in the least possible time. Never before in the history of civilization was brain, as contrasted with brawn, so important; never before, the proper placement and utilization of brainpower so essential to success.
>
> Our War Department, nerved to exceptional risks by the stern necessity for early victory, saw and immediately seized its opportunity to develop various new lines of personnel work. Among these is numbered the psychological service. Great will be our good fortune if the lesson in human engineering which the war has taught is carried over directly and effectively into our civil institutions and activities."

The purposes of these psychological tests were, as stated in the army orders; "(a) to aid in segregating the mentally incompetent, (b) to classify men according to their mental capacity, (c) to assist in selecting competent men for responsible positions." And to quote a subsequent official pronouncement after the administration of the tests: "In the opinion of this office three reports indicate very definitely that the desired results have been achieved."

So much for the aims behind the tests. Now for the tests themselves. As already stated, they were administrated to more than 1,700,000 officers and men. Great care was taken to eliminate the disturbing influence of environmental factors like lack of education and ignorance of the English language. Separate tests were devised, and the close correlations obtained showed that inborn intelligence had been successfully segregated. Besides general intelligence gradings, special studies according to army rank, civilian occupation, racial origin, etc., were made on large groups consisting of "samples" taken at many points from the general mass.

The following is the system of general grading employed to indicate the degree of individual intelligence:

- A = very superior intelligence

  B = superior intelligence

  C+ = high average intelligence

  C = average intelligence

  C- = low average intelligence

  D = inferior intelligence

  D- = very inferior intelligence

  E = “unteachable men,” rejected at once or after a short time

Let us now see how the 1,700,000 men examined graded according to intelligence, and what *mental* age these classifications implied:

A	4½	18-19 (+)
B	9	16-17
C+	16½	15
C	25	13-14
C-	20	12
D	15	11
D-	10	10

This table is assuredly depressing. Probably never before has the relative scarcity of high intelligence been so vividly demonstrated. It strikingly reinforces what biologists and sociologists have long been telling us: that the number of really superior persons is small, and that the great majority of even the most civilized populations are of mediocre or low intelligence—which, be it remembered, neither

education nor any other environmental agency can ever raise. Think of this table's social significance! Assuming that these 1,700,000 men are a fair sample of the entire population of approximately 100,000,000 (and there is every reason to believe that it is a fair sample), this means that the *average* mental age of Americans is only about fourteen; that forty-five millions, or nearly one-half of the whole population, will never develop mental capacity beyond the stage represented by a normal twelve year old child; that only thirteen and one-half millions will ever show superior intelligence, and that only four and one-half millions can be considered "talented."

Still more alarming is the prospect for the future. The overwhelming weight of evidence (as we shall later show) indicates that the A and B elements in America are barely reproducing themselves, while the other elements are increasing at rates proportionate to their decreasing intellectual capacity: in other words, that intelligence is day being steadily *bred out of* the American population.

So much for the general results of the American army tests. Now let us consider some of the special classifications, notably those relating to the correlation of intelligence with army rank, civilian occupation, and racial origin.

In all these special classifications the correlations were precisely what our study might lead us to expect. First, as to army rank: the great majority of officers, whether actually commissioned or in officers' training-camps, were found to be of A and B intelligence. Furthermore, in those branches of the service where a high degree of technical knowledge is required, the highest degree of intelligence was found. In the engineers and the artillery nearly all the officers graded A; whereas, in the veterinary corps less than one-sixth of the officers graded A, and nearly two-fifths graded C. Among the non-coms (sergeants and corporals) one-half or more graded C. The rank and file were mostly C men, with a small minority of A's and B's, and a somewhat larger minority of D's (E men, of course, being excluded from the service).

Next, as to the correlation between intelligence and civilian occupations: the professions were found to contain a great majority of A and B men; the percentage of superior intelligence sank steadily through the skilled and semi-skilled occupations, until it was least of all among the common laborers, very few of whom were found to possess intelligence grading higher than C, while most of them graded C or D. Space forbids the textual reproduction of the statistical tables, which are very elaborate; but any one who cares to examine them in the works already quoted will see at a glance how symmetrical and logical are the gradings. Finally, as to the correlation between intelligence and racial origin, two separate researches were made. The first of these was a comparison between white and colored drafted men; the other was a double grading of drafted men of foreign birth. Let us visualize the results of the intelligence ratings of white and colored—by the following table—adding one other category (that of the officers) to visualize the difference between the intelligence level of the officers' corps and the levels of both white and colored drafted men:

	A	B	C+	C	C-	D	D-	E
White-Draft	2.0	4.8	9.7	20	22	30	8	2
Colored-Draft	.8	1.0	1.9	6	15	37	30	7
Officers	55.0	29.0	12.0	4	0	0	0	0

The above table needs no comment: It speaks for itself!

Now, as to the second study concerning the correlation between intelligence and racial origin: the grading of foreign-born drafted men. This investigation, as already stated, was dual: the men were graded both up and down the scale; *i.e.*, both according to superiority and inferiority of intelligence. In the following tables "superiority" means A and B grades combined, while "inferiority" means D and E grades combined.

TABLE I: PERCENTAGE OF INFERIORITY

Country of Birth	%	Country of Birth	%
England	87	Norway	25.6
Holland	92	Austria	37.4
Denmark	13.4	Ireland	39.4
Scotland	13.6	Turkey	42.0
Germany	15.0	Greece	43.6
Sweden	19.4	Russia	60.4
Canada	19.5	Italy	60.4
Belgium	24.0	Poland	69.9

TABLE I: PERCENTAGE OF SUPERIORITY

Country of Birth	%	Country of Birth	%
England	19.7	Ireland	4.1
Scotland	13.0	Turkey	3.4
Holland	10.7	Austria	3.4
Canada	10.5	Russia	2.7
Germany	8.3	Greece	2.1
Denmark	5.4	Italy.	.8
Sweden	4.3	Belgium	.8
Norway	4.1	Poland	.5

These tables are very interesting. Note how constant are the positions of the national groups in both tables. Also, note how surely a high percentage of superiority connotes a low percentage of inferiority—and *vice versa*. Of course, these tables refer merely to the intelligence of foreign-born groups *in America*; they may not be particularly good criteria for the entire home populations of the countries mentioned. But they *do* give us a good indication of the sort of people America is getting by immigration from those countries, and they indicate clearly the intelligence levels of the various foreign-born groups in America. And, once more we see a confirmation of those biological, sociological, and psychological researches which we have previously mentioned; viz., that the intelligence level of the racial elements which America has received from northern Europe is far above that of the south and east European elements.

We have already indicated how great are the possibilities for the practical employment of mental tests, not merely of the army but also in education, industry, and the evaluation of whole populations and races. "Before the war mental engineering was a dream; to-day it exists, and its effective development is amply assured."

As yet psychology has not succeeded in measuring emotional and psychic qualities as it has done with intellectual faculties. But progress is being made in this direction, and the data accumulated already indicate not only that these qualities are inherited but also that they tend to be correlated with intelligence. Speaking of superior military qualities like loyalty, bravery, power to command, and ability to "carry on," Majors Yoakum and Yerkes state: "In the long run, these qualities are far more likely to be found in men of superior intelligence than in men who are intellectually inferior."

Furthermore, whatever the direct correlation between intellectual and moral qualities, there is an undoubted practical connection, owing to the rational control exerted by the intellect over the spirit and the emotions. As Professor Lichtenberger remarks concerning the statement just quoted: "It would seem almost superfluous to add that loyalty, bravery, and even power to command, without sufficiently

high intelligence may result in foolhardiness. They are forces of character, and we should devise methods of evaluating them, but, like all forces, organic and inorganic, they are valuable to the extent to which they are disciplined and controlled. The case is somewhat similar with respect to the emotions. … Probably it will not be long until we shall have some method of measuring the quality of emotional disturbances, and this will increase the accuracy of our judgments; but to whatever degree of independence the emotions may be assigned, their utility is determined by the discipline of intelligence. Emotional control is weak in those of low mental level. The higher the level, the greater the possibility of rational control."

We have thus far considered the nature of intelligence, and we have found it to be an inborn quality whose capacity is predetermined by heredity. Biologically, this is important, because a man may not make much actual use of his talents and yet pass them on to children who will make use of them. In every-day life, however, capacity is important chiefly as it expresses itself in practical performance as evidenced by knowledge and action. We here enter a field where environment plays an important part, since what a man actually learns or does depends obviously upon environmental factors like education, training, and opportunity. Let us once more recall the distinction between "intelligence" and "knowledge." Intelligence being the *capacity* of the mind, knowledge the *filling* of the mind. Let us also remember the true meaning of the word "education"—a "bringing forth" of that which potentially exists.

Now, precisely how does environment affect performance? In extreme cases environment may be of major importance. A genius, condemned for life to the fate of Robinson Crusoe, would obviously accomplish very little; while, on the other hand, a man of mediocre capacity, if given every possible advantage, might make the utmost of his slender talents. But how is it under ordinary circumstances—especially under those substantially equal circumstances which it is the avowed aim of modern democratic ideals to produce?

Before discussing this point in detail, however, let us stop and find out

just what we mean by "equal circumstances." Do we mean equality of *opportunity*? Or do we mean equality of *performance and recompense*? The two ideas are poles asunder; yet they are often confused in thought, and frequently intentionally confused in argument. Equality of opportunity means freedom of different individuals to make the most of similar conditions, and, by logical implication, freedom to reap rewards proportionate to respective achievements. Equality of performance and recompense, on the contrary, means the fixing of certain standards according to which action will be stimulated and rewards apportioned. This last is what most of the hot-gospellers of levelling "social equality" have in the back of their heads. They may camouflage their doctrines with fine phrases, but what they really intend is to handicap and defraud superior intelligence in order to "give everybody a fair show." Even in our present social system we see many instances of the waste and injustice caused by "levelling" practices: bright pupils held back to keep step with dullards and bright workmen discouraged from doing their best by grasping employers or ordered to "go slow" by union rules setting the pace by their less competent fellows.

This distinction being understood, let us now see how environment affects performance with individuals under conditions of equal opportunity. How, for example, does equality of training or education affect individual achievement? The answer is another striking proof of the power of heredity. Not only is such equality of conditions unable to level the inborn differences between individuals; on the contrary, it *increases the differences in results achieved.* "Equalizing practice seems to increase differences. The superior man seems to have got his present superiority by his own nature rather than by superior advantages of the past, since, during a period of equal advantage for all, he increases his lead." As McDougall justly remarks: "The higher the level of innate capacity, the more is it improved by education."

We thus see that even where superior individuals have no better opportunities than inferiors, environment tends to accentuate rather than equalize the differences between men, and that the only way to

prevent increasing in equality is by deliberately holding the superiors down.

Certainly, the whole trend of civilization is toward increasing inequality. In the first place, the demands made upon the individual are more and more complex and differentiated. The differences in training and education between savages are relatively insignificant; the differences between the feudal baron and his serf were comparatively slight; the differences to-day between casual laborers and captains of industry are enormous. Never before has the function of capacity been so important and so evident.

The truth is that, as civilization progresses, social status tends to coincide more and more closely with racial value; in other words, a given population tends to become more and more differentiated biologically, the upper social classes containing an ever larger proportion of persons of superior natural endowments while the lower social classes contain a growing proportion of inferior. The intelligence tests which we have previously considered show us how marked this tendency has become in advanced modern societies like England and the United States, and there is every reason to believe that unless the civilizing process be interrupted this stratification will become even sharper in the future.

Now, precisely how does this increasing stratification come about? We have already discussed this point in a general way. We have seen how the dynamic urge of superior germ-plasm surmounts environmental barriers and raises the individual socially; while, conversely, inferior individuals tend to sink in the social scale.

Let us now look at the matter more closely. This process, by which individuals migrate socially upward or downward from class to class, is termed “The Social Ladder.” The ease with which people can go up or down this ladder depends on the flexibility of the social order, and social flexibility in turn characterizes progressive civilizations. In the less advanced types of civilization, social flexibility is rare. Society crystallizes into closed castes, sons are compelled to follow the

callings of their fathers, superior individuals cannot rise, and high-born inferiors are kept from sinking to their proper levels. This means waste, inefficiency and imperfect utilization of human resources.

However, as civilization progresses, its very complexity and needs compel greater efficiency; society becomes more flexible; and the "social ladder" works better and better. Latent talent rises more easily from the ranks, while the upper class cuts out more of its dead-wood, and thus tends to free itself from degenerate taints which have ruined so many aristocratic castes. The abounding vigor of American life, for example, is largely due to the way in which ability tends to be recognized wherever it appears and is given a chance to "make good." Thus, in course of time, the superior strains in a population rise to the top, while the inferior elements sink to the bottom. The upper classes are continually enriched by good new blood, while the lower classes, drained of their best elements, are increasingly impoverished and become increasingly inferior.

This segregation of populations according to racial value is produced, not merely by the social ladder, but by another process known as "assortative mating." Contrary to certain romantic but erroneous notions, careful scientific investigation has proved conclusively that "like tends to mate with like." Giants am not prone to marry dwarfs, nor do extreme blonds usually prefer dark brunettes. And what is true of physical characteristics is equally true of mental and emotional qualities. People tend to marry those not too unlike themselves. And, in addition to the action of personal preference, there is superadded the effect of propinquity. Individuals are usually attracted to those with whom they associate. These am usually of their own clan, with common standards, similar tastes, and like educational attainments. But those are the very persons who are apt to be of the same general type. Thus, as populations get more differentiated, assortative mating widens the class gaps. Superiors tend more and mom to marry superiors, mediocrity tends to mate with mediocrity, while the inferior and the degenerate become segregated by themselves.

At first sight it might seem as though the action of the social ladder

would nullify the action of assortative mating. But when we look at the matter more closely we see that this is not the case. Where social flexibility permits individuals to migrate easily, like tends oftener to associate and hence to mate with like. The "self-made man" is more apt to find a wife of his own caliber, and is not compelled to choose exclusively from among the women of the lower social class in which he was born. On the other hand, high-born incompetents or "black sheep," sinking rapidly, are less likely to drag down with them high-type mates. Thus the social ladder and assortative mating, far from conflicting, reinforce each other and sift the population according to true racial values with cumulative effect.

The sustained intermarriage of a well-selected upper class raises society's apex into a sharply defined peak or core. Woods has termed this process "Social Conification." The members of such "conified" groups display clearly marked traits and possess high average racial value. On the other hand, the lowest social classes, segregated and drained of their best elements, similarly "conify" into well-marked racial inferiority.

The extent to which these selective processes, working for generations in a highly civilized society, may drain the lower social classes of their best racial elements, is strikingly shown by the case of England. That marked differences of inborn capacity exist between the British upper and lower social strata has, of course, long been realized, but the rapidity with which the gap has been widening has been recently shown by two historical measurements of the social distribution of genius and talent in the United Kingdom conducted respectively by Havelock Ellis and Doctor Woods. The results of these studies have been ably summarized by Alleyne Ireland, whom I will quote. Says Ireland:

> "What these investigations disclose is that over a period of several centuries there has occurred a striking and progressive decline in the cultural contribution from the 'lower' classes in the United Kingdom, and, of course, a corresponding relative increase in the contribution from the 'upper' and 'middle'

classes.

It appears that, from the earliest times to the end of the nineteenth century, the contribution to eminent achievement made by the sons of craftsmen, artisans, and unskilled laborers yielded 11.7 per cent of the total number of names utilized in the inquiry; that the representatives of that class who were born in the first quarter of the nineteenth century yielded 7.2 per cent of the names; and that those born during the second quarter of the nineteenth century yielded only 4.2 per cent. These figures are of great interest and importance when considered in relation to the social and political history of England during the nineteenth century.

Everybody knows that in England the nineteenth century witnessed a rapid and all-pervading democratization of social and political conditions. It was during that century that the English parliamentary system became, for the first time in the six hundred years of its existence, an institution representative of the great mass of the people; that schooling was made available for all; that in industry, in politics, in society, the gates of opportunity were opened wide for any person, of whatever parentage, who could make any contribution in any field of achievement; that peers became business men and business men peers; that any one whose talents had made him prominent in his calling could entertain a reasonable hope of finding wealth in the favor of the public, and a title of nobility in the appreciation of the political leaders.

With every circumstance of life growing constantly more favorable to the self-assertion of genius and talent in the ‘lower’ classes in England, how was it that the contributions to eminent achievement from that group fell from an average of 11.7 per cent of the total to a proportion of 4.2 per cent?

It seems to me that as the vast improvement in environmental conditions had not only failed to produce an increase in high

> achievement by those whom this improvement had done most to serve, but had, on the contrary, taken place *pari passu* with a very serious decline in achievement, the cause must be sought in an influence powerful enough to offset whatever beneficent effects improved environment might actually exert upon a stationary class during a single generation.
>
> This influence I deem to have been that of assortative mating. Its operation appears to have been of a dual character. On the one hand, the effect in heredity of intelligence mating with intelligence, of stupidity with stupidity, of success with success—to put the matter roughly—has been to perpetuate and to increase these traits in the respective groups. On the other hand, the practical social consequences of these effects being produced under conditions of an ever-broadening democratization of social life has been that the more intelligent and successful elements in the 'lower' classes have been constantly rising out of their class into one socially above it. This movement must have the consequence of draining the 'lower' classes of talent and genius, and, through a process of social migration, of increasing the genius and talent of each succeeding upper layer in the social series."

We thus see that, as civilization progresses, inborn superiority tends to drain out of the lower social levels up into the higher social classes. And probably never before in human history has this selective process gone on so rapidly and so thoroughly as to-day.

But it may be asked: Is this not a matter for rejoicing? Does this not imply the eventual formation of an aristocracy of "supermen," blessing all classes with the flowerings of its creative genius?

Unfortunately, no; *not as society is now constituted.* On the contrary, if these tendencies continue under present social conditions, the concentration of superiority in the upper social levels will spell general racial impoverishment and hence a general decline of civilization. Let us remember that fatal tendency (discussed in the preceding chapter)

to use up and exterminate racial values; to impoverish human stocks by the dual process of socially sterilizing superior strains and multiplying inferiors. The history of civilization is a series of racial tragedies. Race after race has entered civilization's portals; entered in the pink of condition, full of superior strains slowly selected and accumulated by the drastic methods of primitive life. Then, one by one, these races have been insidiously drained of their best, until, unable to carry on, they have sunk back into impotent mediocrity. The only reason why the torch of civilization has continued to flame high is because it has been passed on from hand to hand; because there have always been good stocks still racially protected by primitive conditions who could take up the task.

To-day, however, this is no longer so. The local civilizations of the past have merged into a *world-civilization,* which draws insistently on every high-type stock in existence. That is why our modern civilization has made such marvellous progress—because it has had behind it the pooled intelligence of the planet. But let us not deceive ourselves! Behind this brave show the same fatal tendencies that have wrought such havoc in the past are still working—working as never before! In the next chapter we shall consider closely these factors of racial decline. Suffice it here to state that in every civilized country to-day the superior elements of the population are virtually stationary or actually declining in numbers, while the mediocre and inferior elements are rapidly increasing.

Such is our racial balance-sheet. And, be it remembered: our civilization, unlike its predecessors, cannot shift the burden to other shoulders, because there are no more untapped "racial reserves." No "noble barbarians" wait to step forward as in the past; the barbarians and savages who still remain in the world are demonstrably of inferior caliber and can contribute little or nothing to the progress of civilization.

If, then, our civilization is to survive, it must conserve and foster its own race values. Happily our civilization possesses two great advantages over past times: scientific knowledge and the scientific

spirit. To us have been revealed secrets of life our forebears never knew. And to us has been vouchsafed a passion for the *truth* such as the world has never seen. Other ages have sought truth from the lips of seers and prophets; our age seeks it from scientific *proof*. Other ages have had their saints and martyrs—dauntless souls who clung to the faith with unshakeable constancy. Yet our age has also had its saints and martyrs—heroes who can not only face death for their faith, but who can also *scrap* their faith when facts have proved it wrong. There, indeed, is courage! And therein lies our hope.

This matchless love of truth, this spirit of science which combines knowledge and faith in the synthesis of a higher *wisdom,* as yet inspires only the elite of our time. Most of us are still more or less under the spell of the past—the spell of passion, prejudice, and unreason. It is thus that ideas and ideals clearly disproved by science yet claim the allegiance of multitudes of worthy men.

The dead hand of false doctrines and fallacious hopes lies, indeed, heavy upon us. Laws, institutions, customs, ideas, and ideals are all stamped deep with its imprint. Our very minds and souls are imbued with delusions like environmentalism and "natural equality" from whose emotional grip it is hard to escape. Mighty as is the new truth, our eyes are yet blinded to its full meaning, our hearts shrink instinctively from its wider implications, and our feet falter on the path to higher destinies.

These reactionary forces stubbornly impede the progress of those deep-going eugenic reforms which must speedily be undertaken if our civilization is to be saved from decline and our race from decay.

This is serious enough. But there is something more serious still. The reactionary forces which we have just described, though powerful, are, after all, essentially negative in character. With the spread of enlightenment they would soon wither—if they stood alone. But they do not stand alone. Behind them, sheltered by them, lurks a positive, aggressive force: The Under-Man!

The Under-Man is unconvertible. He will not bow to the new truth,

because he knows that the new truth is not for him. Why should he work for a higher civilization, when even the present civilization is beyond his powers? What the Under-Man wants is, not progress, but *regress*—regress to more primitive conditions in which he would be at home. In fact, the more he grasps the significance of the new eugenic truth, the uglier grows his mood. So long as all men believed all men potentially equal, the Under-Man could delude himself into thinking that changed circumstances might rise him to the top. Now that nature herself proclaims him irremediably inferior, his hatred of superiority knows no bounds.

This hatred he has always instinctively felt. Envy and resentment of superiority have ever been the badges of base minds. Yet never have these badges been so fiercely flaunted, so defiantly worn, as to-day. This explains the seeming paradox that, just when the character of superiority becomes supremely manifest, the cry for levelling "equality" rises supremely shrill. The Under-Man revolts against progress! Nature herself having decreed him uncivilizable, the Under-Man declares war on civilization.

These are not pretty facts. But we had better face them, lest they face us, and catch us unawares. Let us, then, understand once and for all that we have among us a rebel army—the vast host of the unadaptable, the incapable, the envious, the discontented, filled with instinctive hatred of civilization and progress, and ready on the instant to rise in revolt.

Here are foes that need watching. Let us watch them.

CHAPTER III THE NEMESIS OF THE INFERIOR

RACIAL impoverishment is the plague of civilization. This insidious disease, with its twin symptoms the extirpation of superior strains and the multiplication of inferiors, has ravaged humanity like a consuming fire, reducing the proudest societies to charred and squalid ruin.

We have already examined the life process which perpetuates both superiors and inferiors according to their kind, so we can now pass to a practical consideration of inferior types.

First of all, however, let us carefully distinguish between inferiority's two aspects: physical inferiority and mental inferiority. It is mental inferiority which is our chief concern. Physically, the human species seems equal to all demands which are likely to he made upon it. Despite civilization's deleterious aspects, and despite the combined action of modern medicine and philanthropy in keeping alive physically weak individuals, humanity does not appear to be threatened with general physical decay. We are heirs of a physical selection which goes back tens of millions, perhaps hundreds of millions of years to the very origin of life, and its beneficial influence is so wide-spread and deep-going that a few millennia of partial escape from its workings have only superficial effects.

Far different is the case of mental inferiority. The special traits of intelligence which distinguish man from the animals appeared only a few hundred thousand years ago, and have developed strongly only in a few human stocks. Biologically speaking, therefore, high intelligence is a very recent trait, which is still comparatively rare and which may be easily lost.

The rarity of mental as compared with physical superiority in the human species is seen on every hand. Existing savage and barbarian races of a demonstrably low average level of intelligence, like the negroes, are physically vigorous, in fact, possess an animal vitality apparently greater than that of the intellectually higher races. The same is true of intellectually decadent peoples like those about the Mediterranean, whose loss of ancient mental greatness has been

accompanied by no corresponding physical decline. Finally, even among the more civilized and progressive present-day populations, the great disparity between physical and mental superiority is clear. The recent American army intelligence tests are a striking example of this. Those 1,700,000 young men who were examined were nearly all physically fine specimens, yet less than one out of twenty (4½ per cent) possessed really high intelligence. From all this it is evident that mental superiority is comparatively rare, most men being mentally either mediocre or inferior.

We have likewise seen how civilized life has hitherto tended to make mental superiority ever rarer and to increase the proportion of mediocre and inferior elements. Indeed, down to the biological discoveries of our own days, this was believed to be a normal, rather than an abnormal, phenomenon. Our forebears considered society's withering away at the top and breeding from below as natural and inevitable. Take the attitude of the Romans, for example. Roman society was divided into six classes. The sixth, or lowest, social class, made up of paupers, vagabonds, and degenerates, was exempt from civic duties, military service, and the payment of taxes. But was this class debarred from having children? Not at all. On the contrary, it was positively encouraged to do so. These dregs of the Roman populace were termed "proletarians," "producers of offspring"! In other words, a man might be incapable of civic duties, incapable of bearing arms, incapable of paying taxes, but was considered not only capable but specially apt for bearing children, who were accepted as his contribution to society. Think what an attitude on racial matters this implies! No wonder Rome fell! And yet—let us not forget that this was substantially the attitude of our grandfathers, and that it is still the attitude of millions of so-called "educated" persons. Here is once more evident the dead hand of the past, perpetuating old errors and blocking the effective spread of new truths.

This mingling of old and new forces is, in fact, mainly responsible for the peculiarly acute nature of our social and racial problems. Traditional influences making for racial decay are as active as ever,

perhaps more so. On the other hand, many new factors like universal education, high standards, preventive medicine, and birth control, all of which *may* become powerful agents of race betterment, have thus far worked mainly in the direction of racial decay, by speeding up both the social sterilization of superior individuals, and the preservation of inferiors.

Perhaps never before have social conditions been so "dysgenic," so destructive of racial values, as to-day. "In the earlier stages of society, man interfered little with natural selection. But during the last century the increase of the philanthropic spirit and the progress of medicine have done a great deal to interfere with the selective process. In some ways, selection in the human race has almost ceased; in many ways it is actually reversed, that is, it results in the survival of the inferior rather than the superior. In the olden days the criminal was summarily executed, the weakly child died soon after birth through lack of proper care and medical attention, the insane were dealt with so violently that if they were not killed by the treatment they were at least left hopelessly 'incurable,' and had little chance of becoming parents. Harsh measures, all of these; but they kept the germ-plasm of the race reasonably purified.

"To-day, how is it? The inefficients, the wastrels, the physical, mental, and moral cripples are carefully preserved at public expense. The criminal is turned out on parole after a few years, to become the father of a family. The insane is discharged as 'cured,' again to take up the duties of citizenship. The feeble-minded child is painfully 'educated,' often at the expense of his normal brother or sister. In short, the undesirables of the race, with whom the bloody hand of natural selection would have made short work early in life, are now nursed along to old age." And, as already stated, factors like birth control, education, and high social standards are simultaneously extirpating the superior elements at an unprecedented rate.

Such is the situation. Now, what is to he done? Return to the grim methods of "natural selection"? Of course not. No sensible person could possibly advocate such a thing. It would not only outrage our

moral sense, but it would also yield results far inferior to other methods of race betterment which science has already discovered and elaborated. That is the hopeful aspect of the situation. Grave though our present plight may be, we do not have to waste precious time casting about for theoretical solutions. Science, especially that branch of science known as "Eugenics" or "Race Betterment," shows us a way far more efficient as well as infinitely more humane than the crude, wasteful methods of natural selection, which, while killing out most of the bad, took many of the good at the same time. Science, therefore, offers us a way of escape from impending perils, not by a return to natural selection, but by way of an *improved* social selection based upon natural law instead of, as hitherto, upon ignorance and haphazard. Detailed discussion of the eugenic programme will be deferred till the concluding chapter of this book. At present, let us continue our survey of human inferiority, in order better to appreciate how imperative the speedy application of eugenic measures to society has come to be.

Inferiority is most plainly manifest in what are known as the "defective classes"—the feeble-minded, the insane, and certain categories of the deformed and the diseased. Most of these "defectives" suffer from *hereditary* defects—in other words, from defects which are passed on in the germ-plasm from generation to generation. The "defective classes" are not really sundered by any natural line of demarcation from the rest of the population. They are merely terms used to denote those groups of persons who are so obviously afflicted that they can be classified as such. Besides these acute defectives, however, there are vast numbers of persons who show only slight taints, while still others reveal no outward trace whatever, yet carry the defect in their germplasm as a latent or "recessive" quality which may come out in their children, especially if they marry persons similarly tainted.

Defectiveness (or, as it is frequently termed, "degeneracy") is thus seen to be a problem as complex and far-reaching as it is serious. Defective persons are more or less unfit for holding useful places in

the social order and tend to sink into the social depths, where they form those pauper, vagabond, and criminal elements which are alike the burden and the menace of society. Few persons who have not studied the problem of degeneracy have any idea how serious it is. Let us consider these "defective classes."

First of all, the feeble-minded. Feeble-mindedness is a condition characterized by such traits as dull intelligence, low moral sense, lack of self-control, shiftlessness, improvidence, etc. It is highly hereditary, and unfortunately it is frequently associated with great physical strength and vitality, so that feeble-minded persons usually breed rapidly, with no regard for consequences. In former times the numbers of the feeble-minded were kept down by the stern processes of natural selection, but modern charity and philanthropy have protected them and have thus favored their rapid multiplication. The feeble-minded are becoming an increasingly serious problem in every civilized country to-day. The number of obviously feeble-minded persons in the United States is estimated to be at least 300,000. During the last few decades, to be sure, many of the worst cases have been segregated in institutions, where they are of course kept from breeding; but even to-day the number of the segregated is only about 10 or 15 per cent of those who should clearly be under institutional care—the balance, meanwhile, causing endless trouble for both the present and future generations.

The rapidity with which feeble-minded stocks spread, and the damage they do, are vividly illustrated by numerous scientific studies which have been compiled. Both in Europe and America these studies tell the same story: feebleminded individuals segregating in "clans," spreading like cancerous growths, disturbing the social life and infecting the blood of whole communities, and thriving on misguided efforts to "better their condition," by charity and other forms of "social service."

A typical case is that of the "Juke family," which was first investigated in the year 1877, and re-investigated in 1915. To quote from the original study: "From one lazy vagabond nicknamed 'Juke,' born in

rural New York in 1720, whose two sons married five degenerate sisters, six generations numbering about 1,200 persons of every grade of idleness, viciousness, lewdness, pauperism, disease, idiocy, insanity, and criminality were traced. Of the total seven generations, 300 died in infancy; 310 were professional paupers, kept in almshouses a total of 2,300 years; 440 were physically wrecked by their own 'diseased wickedness'; more than half the woman fell into prostitution; 130 were convicted criminals; 60 were thieves; 7 were murderers; only 20 learned a trade, 10 of these in state prison, and all at a state cost of over $1,250,000." By the year 1915, the clan had reached its ninth generation, and had greatly lengthened Its evil record. It then numbered 2,820 individuals, half of whom were alive. About the year 1880 the Jukes had left their original home and had scattered widely over the country, but change of environment had made no material change in their natures, for they still showed "the same feeble-mindedness, indolence licentiousness, and dishonesty, even when not handicapped by the associations of their bad family name and despite the fact of their being surrounded by better social conditions." The cost to the state had now risen to about $2,500,000. As the investigator remarks, all this evil might have been averted by preventing the reproduction of the first Jukes. As it is, the Jukes problem is still with us in growing severity, for in 1915, "out of approximately 600 living feeble-minded and epileptic Jukes, there are only three now in custodial care."

A striking illustration of how superiority and degeneracy are alike rigidly determined by heredity is afforded by the "Kallikak Family," of New Jersey. During the Revolutionary war, one Martin "Kallikak," a young soldier of good stock, had an illicit affair with a feeble minded servant-girl, by whom he had a son. Some years later, Martin married a woman of good family by whom he had several legitimate children. Now, this is what happened: Martin's legitimate children by the woman of good stock all turned out well and founded one of the most distinguished families in New Jersey. "In this family and its collateral branches we find nothing but good representative citizenship. There

are doctors, lawyers, judges, educators, traders, landholders, in short, respectable citizens, men and women prominent in every phase of social life. They have scattered over the United States and are prominent in their communities wherever they have gone. … There have been no feebleminded among them; no illegitimate children; no immoral women; only one man was sexually loose." In sharp contrast to this branch of the family stand the descendants of the feebleminded girl. Of those 480 have been traced. Their record is: 143 clearly feebleminded, 36 illegitimate, 33 grossly immoral (mostly prostitutes), 24 confirmed alcoholics, 3 epileptics, 82 died in infancy, 3 criminals, 8 kept houses of ill fame. Here are two family lines, with the same paternal ancestor, living on the same soil, in the same atmosphere, and under the same general environment; "yet the bar sinister has marked every generation of one and has been unknown in the other."

Melancholy genealogies like these might be cited almost indefinitely. And, be it noted, they represent only direct and obvious damage. The indirect and less obvious damage done by feeblemindedness, though harder to trace, is far more wide-spread and is unquestionably even more serious, as we shall presently show. Before discussing this point, however, let us consider some of the other acutely defective classes.

The insane, though differing in character from the feebleminded, present an even graver problem in many respects. Insanity is, of course, a term embracing all sorts of abnormal mental states, some of which are transient, while others, though incurable, are not inheritable, and, therefore, have no racial significance. But many forms of insanity are clearly hereditary, and the harm done by these unsound strains, spreading through the race and tainting sound stocks, is simply incalculable.

Unlike feeblemindedness, insanity is often associated with very superior qualities, which may render the affected individuals an acute menace to society. The feeble-minded never overturned a state. An essentially negative element, they may drag a civilization down toward sodden degeneracy, but they have not the wit to disrupt it. The

insane, on the other hand, are apt to be intensely dynamic and to misuse their powers for destructive ends. We shall presently see how many apostles of anarchic violence and furious discontent have been persons of ill-balanced mind. Such persons are, of course, rarely "insane" in the technical sense of being clearly "committable" to an asylum. They represent merely one aspect of that vast "outer fringe" of mental unsoundness which is scattered so widely through the general population. But even the acute "asylum cases" are lamentably numerous. In the United States, for example, the asylum population numbers over 200,000, and it is well known that besides those actually in institutions there are multitudes of equally afflicted persons in private custody or even at large.

Another class of pronounced defectives are the epileptics. Epilepsy is clearly hereditary, being probably due, like feeble-mindedness and hereditary insanity, to some factor in the germ-plasm which causes abnormal development. Like insanity, it is often associated with superior mental qualities, but it is even more often associated with feeble-mindedness, and its victims tend to be dangerously antisocial, epilepsy being frequently connected with the worst crimes of violence. The spreading of epileptic strains among sound stocks is unquestionably disastrous, causing grave social dangers and lamentable racial losses.

Besides these outstanding cases of degeneracy there are some other forms of defect which, though individually not so serious, represent in the aggregate a distinct burden to society and drain upon the race. Among these may be classed congenital deafness and blindness, some types of deformity, and certain crippling diseases like Huntington's chorea. All such defects, being hereditary, inflict repeated damage from generation to generation, and tend to spread into sound stocks.

So ends our melancholy survey of the "defective classes." In every civilized country their aggregate numbers are enormous, and, under present social conditions, they are rapidly increasing. In the United States, for example, the total number of the patently feebleminded, insane, and epileptic is estimated to be fully 1,000,000. And, as

already stated, even this alarming total represents merely those persons suffering from the more extreme forms of taints which extend broadcast through the general population. The extent of such contamination is revealed by several estimates made independently by competent investigators who all consider that over 30 per cent of the entire population of the United States carries some form of mental defect. In great part, to be sure, defect is latent in the germ-plasm and does the bearers no harm. Yet the taints are there, and are apt to come out in their children, especially if they marry persons carrying a similar defect in their inheritance.

And, even if we exclude from consideration all purely latent defects, the problem presented by those actually suffering from less acute forms of defect than those previously described is one of almost incalculable gravity for both society and the race. There can be no question that inefficiency, stupidity, pauperism, crime, and other forms of antisocial conduct are largely (perhaps mainly) due to inborn degeneracy. The careful scientific investigations conducted in many countries on paupers, tramps, criminals, prostitutes, chronic inebriates, drug fiends, etc., have all revealed a high percentage of mental defect. When to these out-and-out social failures we add the numberless semi-failures, grading all the way from the "unemployable" casual laborer to the "erratic genius" wasting or perverting his talents, we begin to realize the truly terrible action of inherited degeneracy, working generation after generation, tainting and spoiling good stocks, imposing heavier social burdens, and threatening the future of civilization.

For degeneracy *does* threaten civilization. The presence of vast hordes of congenital inferiors—incapable, unadaptable, discontented, and unruly—menaces the social order with both dissolution and disruption.

The biologist Humphrey well describes the perils of the situation. "So," he writes, "the army of the poorly endowed grows in every civilized land, by addition as new incompetency is revealed, and by its own rapid multiplication; and to this level the human precipitate from every degenerative influence in civilization eventually settles. It is a

menace already of huge proportions, but we succeed well in America in covering the extent and rapidity of its growth with soothing drafts of charity. And most of us rather like to remain blind to the increasing proportion of poor human material. Human interest centres upon vigor, strength, achievement. Its back is toward those who fail to achieve—until, perhaps, their sheer force of numbers brings them into unpleasant view.

> "As one reviews the latter days of the Roman Empire and reads of the many devices in the way of public entertainments for amusing and controlling the hordes of the unsocial who had accumulated most grievously, the question arises: How soon will we arrive at the time when our unsocial masses shall have become unwieldy? One thing is certain: our more humanitarian methods are bringing the fateful day upon us at a more rapid rate. And our boasted Americanism is not a cure for mental incompetency. The police blotters of our cities will show that the mobs which spring up from nowhere at the slightest let-up in police control are mostly American-born, with scarcely an illiterate among them; yet they revert to the sway of their animal instincts quite as spontaneously as benighted Russians.
>
> It is folly to keep up the delusion that more democracy and more education will make over these all-born into good citizens. Democracy was never intended for degenerates, and a nation breeding freely of the sort that must continually be repressed is not headed toward an extension of democratic liberties. Rather, it is inevitable that class lines shall harden as a protection against the growing numbers of the underbred, just as in all previous cultures. However remote a cataclysm may be, our present racial trend is toward social chaos or a dictatorship.
>
> Meanwhile, we invite social turmoil by advancing muddled notions of equality. Democracy, as we loosely idealize it nowadays, is an overdrawn picture of earthly bliss; it stirs the little-brained to hope for an impossible levelling of human beings. The most we can honestly expect to achieve is a fair

> levelling of *opportunity;* but every step toward that end brings out more distinctly those basic inequalities of inheritance which no environmental effort can improve. So discontent is loudest in those least capable of grasping opportunity when it is offered."

In this connection we must never forget that it is the "high-grade" defectives who are most dangerous to the social order. It is the "near-genius," the man with the fatal taint which perverts his talents, who oftenest rouses and leads the mob. The levelling social revolutionary doctrines of our own day, like Syndicalism, Anarchism, and Bolshevism, superficially alluring yet basically false and destructive, are essentially the product of unsound thinking—*by unsound brains*. The sociologist Nordan ably analyzes the enormous harm done by such persons and doctrines, not only by rousing the degenerate elements, but also by leading astray vast numbers of average people, biologically normal enough yet with intelligence not high enough to protect them against clever fallacies clothed in fervid emotional appeals. Says Nordau:

> "Besides the extreme forms of degeneracy there are milder forms, more or less inconspicuous, not to be diagnosed at a first glance. These, however, are the most dangerous for the community, because their destructive influence only gradually makes itself felt; we are not on our guard against it; indeed, in many cases, we do not recognize it as the real cause of the evils it conjures up—evils whose serious importance no one can doubt.
>
> A mattoid or half-fool, who is full of organic feelings of dislike, generalizes his subjective state into a system of pessimism, of 'Weltschmertz'—weariness of life. Another, in whom a loveless egoism dominates all thought and feeling, so that the whole exterior world seems to him hostile, organizes his antisocial instincts into the theory of anarchism. A third, who suffers from moral insensibility, so that no bond of sympathy links him with his fellow man or with any living thing, and who is obsessed by vanity amounting to megalomania, preaches a doctrine of the Superman, who is to know no consideration and no compassion, be bound by no moral principle, but 'live his own life' without

regard for others. When these half-fools, as often happens, speak an excited language—when their imagination, unbridled by logic or understanding, supplies them with odd, startling fancies and surprising associations and images—their writings make a strong impression on unwary readers, and readily gain a decisive influence on thought in the cultivated circles of their time.

Of course, well-balanced persons are not thereby changed into practising disciples of these morbid cults. But the preachings of these mattoids are favorable to the development of similar dispositions in others; serve to *polarize,* in their own sense, tendencies of hitherto uncertain drift, and give thousands the courage openly, impudently, boastfully, to confess and act in accordance with convictions which, but for these theorists with their noise and the flash of their tinsel language, they would have felt to be absurd or infamous, which they would have concealed with shame; which in any case would have remained monsters known only to themselves and imprisoned in the lowest depths of their consciousness.

So, through the influence of the teachings of degenerate half-fools, conditions arise which do not, like the cases of insanity and crime, admit of expression in figures, but can nevertheless in the end be defined through their political and social effects. We gradually observe a general loosening of morality, a disappearance of logic from thought and action, a morbid irritability and vacillation of public opinion, a relaxation of character. Offenses are treated with a frivolous or sentimental indulgence which encourages rascals of all kinds. People lose the power of moral indignation, and accustom themselves to despise it as something banal, unadvanced, inelegant, and unintelligent. Deeds that would formerly have disqualified a man forever from public life are no longer an obstacle in his career, so that suspicious and tainted personalities make it possible to rise to responsible positions, sometimes to the control of national business. Sound common sense becomes more rarely and less

> worthily appreciated, more and more meanly rated. Nobody is shocked by the most absurd proposals, measures and fashions, and folly rules in legislation, administration, domestic and foreign politics. Every demagogue finds a following, every fool collects adherents, every event makes an impression beyond all measure, kindles ridiculous enthusiasm, spreads morbid consternation, leads to violent manifestations in one sense or the other and to official proceedings that are at least useless, often deplorable and dangerous. Everybody harps upon his 'rights' and rebels against every limitation of his arbitrary desires by law or custom. Everybody tries to escape from the compulsion of discipline and to shake off the burden of duty."

Such is the destructive action of degeneracy, spreading like a cancerous blight and threatening to corrode society to the very marrow of its being. Against these assaults of inferiority; against the cleverly led legions of the degenerate and the backward; where can civilization look for its champions? Where but in the slender ranks of the racially superior—those "A" and "B" stocks which, in America for example, we know to-day constitute barely 13½ per cent of the population? It is this "thin red line" of rich, untainted blood which stands between us and barbarism or chaos. There alone lies our hope. Let us not deceive ourselves by prating about government," "education," "democracy"; our laws, our constitutions, our very sacred books, are in the last analysis mere paper barriers, which will hold only so long as there stand behind them men and women with the intelligence to understand and the character to maintain them.

Yet this life-line of civilization is not only thin but is wearing thinner with a rapidity which appalls those fully aware of the facts. We have already stated that probably never before in human history have social conditions been so destructive of racial values as to-day, because of both the elimination of superior stocks and the multiplication of inferiors.

One dangerous fallacy we must get out of our heads; the fallacy of judging human populations by what we see among wild varieties of

plants and animals. Among these latter we observe a marked stability of type, and we are apt to conclude that, for man as for other life forms, "evolution is a slow process" in which a few generations count for little, and therefore that we need not worry overmuch about measures of race betterment because we have "plenty of time."

A perilous delusion, this! and a further indication of our unsound thinking and superficial knowledge of the laws of life. A trifle more intelligent reflection would show us the profound unlikeness of the two cases. Animals and plants (where not "domesticated" by man) live in the "state of nature," where they are subjected to the practically unvarying action of "natural selection." Their germ-plasm varies in quality just like human germ-plasm (as skilful breeders like Luther Burbank have conclusively proved); but with them natural selection eliminates all but a narrow range of characteristics which keeps the breed at a fixed level; whereas civilized man, living largely under self-made conditions, replaces natural selection by various social selections which produce the most profound—*and rapid*—modifications.

There is a point which we must keep in mind: the *rapidity* with which the qualities of a species can be altered by a change in the character of biological selection. It is literally amazing to observe how mankind has for ages been wasting its best efforts in the vain attempt to change *existing individuals,* instead of changing the *race* by determining *which* existing individuals should, and should not, produce the next generation.

Of course, racial change by means of social selection have not waited for man to discover them; they have been going on from time immemorial. The trouble is that, instead of lifting humanity to the heights, as they might have done if intelligently directed, they have been working haphazard and have usually wrought decadence and ruin.

The startling rapidity with which a particular stock may be either bred into, or out of, a given population can be accurately determined by discovering its rate of increase compared to that of the rest of the

population. And the ultimate factor in this rate of increase is what is known as the "differential birth-rate." It has long been known that populations breeding freely tend to increase extremely fast. But what is true of a population as a whole applies equally to any of its constituent elements. Thus, in any given population, those elements which reproduce themselves the fastest will dominate the average character of the nation—*and will do so at an increasing rate*. Let us take a rather moderate example of a differential birth-rate to show how differences barely noticeable from year to year may in a few generations entirely transform the racial scene. Take two stocks each consisting of 1,000 individuals, the one *just* failing to reproduce itself while the other increases at, say, the rate of the general English population—by no means an extreme level of fecundity. At the end of a year the first stock will have become 996, at the end of a century it will have declined to 687, while after two centuries it will number only 472. On the other hand, the second stock will after a year number 1,013, in a century 3,600, and in two centuries about 13,000. In other words, at the end of a hundred years (from three to four generations) the more prolific stock would outnumber the less prolific by 6 to 1, and in two centuries by 30 to 1. Assuming that the decreasing stock possessed marked ability while the prolific stock was mediocre or inferior, the impoverishment of the race and the setback to civilization can be estimated.

Now, the example above offered has been purposely simplified by combining other factors like differential death and marriage rates which should be separately considered in estimating the relative rates of increase between different groups or stocks. But it does give a fairly accurate idea of the present average difference in net fecundity between the very superior and the *mediocre* elements in the leading nations of the civilized world, while it *greatly understates* the fecundity of the distinctly *inferior* elements. The alarming truth is that in almost all civilized countries the birth-rate of the superior elements has been declining rapidly for the past half century, until to-day, despite a greatly lowered death-rate, they are either

stationary or actually decreasing in numbers; whereas the other elements are increasing at rates proportionate to their mediocrity and inferiority. These facts have been conclusively proved by a multitude of scientific researches conducted throughout Europe and in the United States.

We can accurately determine the point at which a group should just reproduce itself by discovering its death and marriage rates and then estimating the average number of children that should be born to those persons who marry. Taking the civilized world as a whole, it has been found that about four children should be born per marriage if a stock is to reproduce itself. In a few countries like Australia and New Zealand, and in certain high-grade groups, where the death-rates are very low, an average of three children per marriage may be enough to reproduce the stock, but that seems to be about the absolute minimum of fecundity which will ever suffice.

Now, bearing in mind these reproductive minima, what do we actually find? We find that in Europe (excluding the more backward countries) the superior elements of the population average from two to four children per marriage; that the mediocre elements average from four to six children per marriage; that the inferior elements, considered as a whole, average from six to seven and one-half children per marriage; while the most inferior elements like casual laborers, paupers, and feeble-minded defectives, considered separately, average about seven to eight children (illegitimate births of course included). The differential birth-rates in the different quarters of the great European cities are typical. Some years before the late war, the French sociologist Bertillon found that in Paris and Berlin the births in the slum quarters were more than three times as numerous as the births in the best residential sections, while in London and Vienna they were about two and one-half times as numerous.

In the United States conditions are no better than in Europe—in some respects they seem to be rather worse. Outside of the South and parts of the West the old native American stock is not reproducing itself, the birth-rates of immigrant stocks from northern and western Europe are

rapidly falling, while the birth-rates among the immigrant stocks from southern and eastern Europe remain high and show comparatively slight diminution. The American intellectual groups are much less fertile than similar European groups. The average number of children per married graduate of the leading American colleges like Harvard and Yale is about two, while among the leading women's colleges it is about one and one-half. Furthermore, the marriage-rates of college men and women are so low that, considering married and single graduates together, the statistical average is about one and one-half children per college man and something less than three-fourths of a child per college woman. Professor Cattell has investigated the size of families of 440 American men of science, choosing only those cases in which the ages of the parents indicated that the family was completed. Despite a very low death-rate, the birth-rate was so much lower that, as he himself remarks, "it is obvious that the families are not self-perpetuating. The scientific men under fifty, of whom there are 261 with completed families, have on the average 1.88 children, about 12 per cent of whom die before the age of marriage. What proportion will marry we do not know; but only about 75 per cent of Harvard and Yale graduates marry; only 50 per cent of the graduates of colleges for women marry. A scientific man has on the average about seven-tenths of an adult son. If three-fourths of his sons and grandsons marry, and their families continue to be of the same size, 1,000 scientific men will leave about 350 grandsons to marry and transmit their names and their hereditary traits. The extermination will be still more rapid in female lines."

In sharp contrast to these figures, note the high birthrates in the tenement districts of America's great cities. In New York, for example, the birth-rate on the East Side is over four times the birth-rate in the smart residential districts. Commenting on similar conditions in Pittsburg, where the birth-rate in the poorest ward is three times that of the best residential ward, Messrs. Popenoe and Johnson remark: "The significance of such figures in natural selection must be evident. Pittsburgh, like probably all large cities in civilized countries, breeds

from the bottom. The lower a class is in the scale of intelligence, the greater is its reproductive contribution. Recalling that intelligence is inherited, that like begets like in this respect, one can hardly feel encouraged over the quality of the population of Pittsburgh a few generations hence."

Furthermore, it must not be forgotten that such differential birth-rates imply for America problems more complex even than those in Europe; because, whereas in Europe they involve mainly shifts in group-intelligence, in America they mean also changes of race with all that that implies in modifications of fundamental national temperaments, ideals, and institutions. And that is precisely what is taking place in many parts of America to-day. New England, for example, once the prolific nursery of the ambitious, intelligent "Yankee stock," which trekked forth in millions to settle the West, is fast ceasing to be Anglo-Saxon country. In Massachusetts the birth-rate of foreign-born women is two and one-half times as high as the birth-rate among the native-born; in New Hampshire two times; in Rhode Island one and one-half times—the most prolific of the alien stocks being Poles, Polish and Russian Jews, South Italians, and French-Canadians. What this may mean after a few generations is indicated by a calculation made by the biologist Davenport, who stated that, at present rates of reproduction, 1000 Harvard graduates of to-day would have only fifty descendants two centuries hence, whereas 1,000 Rumanians to-day in Boston, at their present rate of breeding, would have 100,000 descendants in the same space of time.

To return to the more general aspect of the problem, it is clear that both in Europe and America the quality of the population is deteriorating, the more intelligent and talented strains being relatively or absolutely on the decline. Now, this can mean nothing less than a deadly menace both to civilization and the race. Let us consider how the psychological experts who formulated the American army intelligence tests characterized the upper intelligence grades. "A" men were described as possessed of "the ability to make a superior record in college"; "B" men "capable of making an average

record in college"; "C" men "rarely capable of finishing a high school course"; and, on the basis of the army ratings, nearly 75 per cent of the whole population of the United States is to-day below the C+ level!

Since the American population (with the exception of its south and east European immigrant stocks and its negroes) probably average about as high in intelligence as do the north European peoples, it is not difficult to foresee that if intelligence continues to be bred out of the race at its present rate, civilization will either slump or crash from sheer lack of brains. The fatal effects of a brain famine are well described by Professor McDougall in the following lines:

> "The civilization of America depends on your continuing to produce A and B men in fair numbers. And at present the A men are 4 per cent, the B men 8 per cent, and you are breeding from the lower part of the curve. The A men and B men, the college-bred, do not maintain their numbers, while the population swells enormously. If this goes on for a few generations, will not the A men, and even the B men, become rare as white elephants, dropping to a mere fraction of 1 per cent? It is only too probable.
>
> The present tendency seems to be for the whole curve to shift toward the wrong end with each successive generation. And this is probably true of moral qualities, as well as intellectual stature. If the time should come when your A and B men together are no more than 1 per cent, or a mere fraction of 1 per cent, of the population, what will become of your civilization?
>
> Let me state the case more concretely, in relation to one of the great essential professions of which I have some inside knowledge; namely, the medical profession. Two hundred or one hundred years ago, the knowledge to be acquired by the medical student, before entering upon the practice of his profession, was a comparatively small body of empirical rules. The advance of civilization has enormously multiplied this knowledge, and the very existence of our civilized communities depends upon the continued and effective application of this vast body of medical

art and science. The acquiring and the judicious application of this mass of knowledge makes very much greater demands upon the would-be practitioner than did the mastery of the body of rules of our forefathers. Accordingly the length of the curriculum prescribed for our medical students has constantly to be drawn out, till now its duration is some six years of postgraduate study.

The students who enter upon this long and severe course of study are already a selected body; they have passed through high school and college successfully. We may fairly assume that the great majority of them belong to the A or B or at least the C+ group in the army scale of intelligence.

What proportion of them, do you suppose, prove capable of assimilating the vast body of medical knowledge to the point that renders them capable of applying it intelligently and effectively? If I may venture to generalize from my own experience, I would say that a very considerable proportion, even of those who pass their examinations, fail to achieve such effective assimilation. The bulk of modern medical knowledge is too vast for their capacity of assimilation, its complexity too great for their power of understanding. Yet medical science continues to grow in bulk and complexity, and the dependence of the community upon it becomes ever more intimate.

In this one profession, then, which makes such great and increasing demands on both the intellectual and the moral qualities of its members, the demand for A and B men steadily increases; and the supply in all probability is steadily diminishing with each generation.

And what is taking place in this one profession is, it would seem, taking place in all the great professions and higher callings. Our civilization, by reason of its increasing complexity, is making constantly increasing demands upon the qualities of its bearers; the qualities of those bearers are diminishing or deteriorating, rather than improving."

The larger aspects of the problem are ably stated by Whetham, who writes: “When we come to consider the birth-rate as at present affecting our social structure, we find that it is highest in those sections of the community which, like the feebleminded and the insane, are devoid of intelligent personality, or, like many of the unemployed and casual laborers, seem to be either without ideals or without any method of expressing them. In all the social groups which have hitherto been distinguished for coherence, for industry, for good mental and physical capacity, for power of organization and administration, the birth-rate has fallen below the figures necessary to maintain the national store of these qualities. Great men are scarce; the group personality is becoming indistinct and the personality of the race, by which success was attained in the past, is therefore on the wane, while the forces of chaos are once more being manufactured in our midst ready to break loose and destroy civilization when the higher types are no longer sufficient in numbers and effectiveness to guide, control or subdue them.”

The unprecedented rapidity of our racial impoverishment seems due, as already stated, to many causes, some old and others new. We have seen that the stressful complexity of high civilizations has always tended to eliminate superior stocks by diverting their energy from racial ends to individual or social ends, the effects showing in an increase of celibacy, late marriage, and few children. Most of the phenomena underlying these racially destructive phenomena can be grouped under two heads: the high cost of living and the cost of high living. Behind those two general phrases stand a multitude of special factors, such as rising prices, higher standards, desire for luxury, social emulation, inefficient government, high taxation, and (last but not least) the pressure of ever-multiplying masses of low-grade, incompetent humanity, acting like sand in the social gears and consuming an ever-larger portion of the national wealth and energy for their charitable relief, doctoring, educating, policing, etc.

Now, all these varied factors, whatever their nature, have this in common: they tend to make children more and more of a burden for

the superior individual, however necessary such children may be for civilization and the race. The fact is that, under present conditions, comparatively few people of the right sort can afford to raise large families of well-born, well-cared-for, and well-educated children. This is the basic reason for that sharp drop in the birth-rates of the upper and middle classes of all civilized lands which has occurred during the past half century. Of course, the drop has been hastened by the simultaneous discovery of various methods for preventing conception which are collectively termed "birth control." However, it was not so much the new methods as the insistent economic and social pressure to employ them which accounts for the rapidity in the fecundal decline. Under the conditions of modern life a pronounced decline in the birth-rate was inevitable. To cite only one of several reasons, the progress of medical science had greatly reduced the death-rate and had thus made possible an enormous net increase of population. To have maintained an unchecked birth-rate would have meant for the Western nations congested masses of humanity like those of Asia, dwelling on a low level of poverty.

To escape this fate, the more intelligent and farsighted elements in every civilized land began quickly to avail themselves of the new contraceptive methods and to limit the size of their families in this manner. That raised a great public outcry (largely on religious grounds), and in most countries the imparting of contraceptive knowledge was legally prohibited. Such action was extremely stupid—and very disastrous. To farsighted communities it should have been evident that with the appearance of new social factors like lowered death-rates, higher living costs, and rising standards, a lower birth-rate was simply inevitable; that civilized peoples could not, and would not, go on breeding like animals, as they had done in the old days of cheap living and low standards, when a high birth-rate was offset by the unchecked ravages of death.

But, a reduced birth-rate being inevitable, the only questions which remained were: How, and by whom, should it be reduced? Should it be by the traditional methods of celibacy (tempered by illicit sex-

relations and prostitution), deferred marriage, infanticide, and abortion; or should it be by the new contraceptive methods? Again: Should all sections of the population lower their birth-rates, or should only the more intelligent classes? Unfortunately for the race, it was the latter alternative which prevailed. Instead of spreading contraceptive knowledge among the masses and thus mitigating as far as possible the evils of a racially destructive differential birth-rate, society succeeded in keeping the masses in ignorance and high fecundity, whereas it emphatically did not succeed in keeping contraceptive knowledge from the more intelligent, who increasingly practised birth control—and diminished their contributions to the population.

Here, then, was a great *potential* instrument of race betterment perverted into an agent of race decadence. With blind insistence upon mere numbers and an utter disregard of quality, society deliberately bettered the inferior elements at the expense of the superiors. The results are such as we have already examined in our study of the differential birthrates of to-day.

So ends our survey of the general factors of race impoverishment. Before closing, however, we must note one special factor of the most melancholy significance—the Great War. The Great War was unquestionably the most appalling catastrophe that ever befell mankind. The racial losses were certainly as grave as the material losses. Not only did the war itself destroy immeasurable racial values, but its aftermath is proving only slightly less unfavorable to the race. Bad social conditions and the frightfully high cost of living continue to depress the birth-rates of all save the most reckless and improvident elements, whose increase is a curse rather than a blessing.

To consider only one of the many causes that to-day keep down the birth-rate of the superior elements of the population, take the crushing burden of taxation throughout Europe, which hits especially the increase of the upper and middle classes. The London *Saturday Review* explained this very clearly when it wrote editorially: “From a man with £2,000 a year the tax-gatherer takes £600. The remaining

£1,400, owing to the decreased value of money, has a purchasing power about equal to £700 a year before the war. No young man will, therefore, think of marrying on less than £2,000 a year. We are thinking of the young man in the upper and middle classes. The man who starts with nothing does not, as a rule, arrive at £2,000 a year until he is past the marrying age. So the continuance of the species will be carried on almost exclusively by the class of manual workers of a low average caliber of brain."

In similar vein the London *Times* describes in the following words what it terms "The Death of the Middle Classes": "The fact is, that with the present cost of living, the present taxation, the present price of houses, a 'family,' as that term used to be understood, is impossible. It means, not discomfort, but privation, with consequent deterioration of health. It is, therefore, far better to bring up one healthy child and afford it a reasonable education than to attempt to bring up three children on insufficient food and without the hope of being able to afford them a training for their life's work. But the mischief does not stop there by any means. It is common knowledge that marriages, especially middle-class marriages being postponed at present on account of housing and food difficulties, and there can be no doubt that many men are avoiding marriage altogether because of the severe financial strain which it imposes. The world is in a gay mood; the attractions of domestic life on a salary barely enough for two are not conspicuous. As a bachelor, a man may indulge his tastes, preserve his freedom of action, and can afford to amuse himself with his friends. He shrinks from the alternative of stern hard work, frugal living, a minimum of pleasure, and a maximum of anxiety." Although the war did not hit America as hard as it did Europe, its racially evil effects are evident here also. A recent editorial of the New York *Times* well describes not merely some of the effects of war, but likewise some of the results of that short-sighted philanthropy which penalizes the thrifty and the self-respecting elements to coddle the charity-seeking and the improvident. Says this editorial:

"Health Commissioner Copeland's statement that the birth-rate

of native Americans is declining in comparison with that of the foreign element in our population contains nothing new, except it be his remark that the decline has been accelerated by the war. That such a result was inevitable has long been evident. A vast preponderance of the foreign element are wage-earners, whose incomes rose doggedly, step by step, with the cost of living. Natives of native parentage are preponderantly brain workers, whose salaries remained much what they had been. The result was a sharp lowering of their standard of living, which could only have checked their already low birth-rate. During the war the Commissioner of Charities, Bird S. Coler, reported that, for the first time in the history of his commission, educated people who had hitherto been self-sustaining and self-respecting members of the middle class brought him their children, saying that they could no longer provide food and clothing.

"Doctor Copeland's statistics of infant mortality tell a similar story. Among infants of native-born mothers the rate is 90 per 1,000—as against 79 for French mothers, 75 for Bohemian, 69 for Austro-Hungarian, 64 for Russian, 58 for Swedish, and 43 for Scotch. This difference Doctor Copeland attributes to the fact that American mothers are less inclined to make use of the Baby Health Stations which are conducted by his department. Foreign-born mothers are 'accustomed to depend on these and other governmental agencies.' It is only under the bitterest compulsion, such as led middle-class parents to bring their children to the Commissioner of Charities, that Americans apply for public aid in their family life. Meantime, these people of native birth pay largely in taxes for the many 'governmental agencies' that aid the immigrant laborer and his family. During the war Henry Fairfield Osborn protested against this inequity on the ground that it was making life impossible for the educated American, whose home is the stronghold of our national traditions.

"How serious the situation has become is evident in the statistics of our population. In 1910, there were in New York 921,318 native

> Americans of native parentage. Of natives of foreign or mixed parentage there were 1,820,141, and of the foreign-born 1,927,703—a total of 3,747,844, as against the 921,318 natives of native parentage. Complete figures for 1920 are not yet available, but Doctor Copeland is authority for the statement that the proportion of those whose traditions are of foreign origin is rapidly increasing. His statement ends with an exhortation against birth-control, the spirit of which is admirable though its logic is not clear. What he has in mind, evidently, is not birth-control but birth-release among Americans of the older immigrations. That, as he apparently believes, is a merely moral matter, but his own statement shows that it has a deeper basis in modern economic conditions. These were doubtless emphasized by the war, but they had been operating for many decades before it and continue to exercise their influence with increasing force."

That is precisely it. The war, terrible as it was, merely hastened a racial impoverishment which had been long at work; wore somewhat thinner the life-line of civilization which was already wearing thin, and spurred to fiercer energy those waxing powers of barbarism and chaos which we shall now directly consider.

CHAPTER IV—THE LURE OF THE PRIMITIVE

THE revolt against civilization goes deeper than we are apt to suppose. However elaborate and persuasive may be the modern doctrines of revolt, they are merely conscious "rationalizings" of an instinctive urge which arises from the emotional depths. One of our hard, but salutary, disillusionments is the knowledge that our fathers were mistaken in their fond belief about automatic progress. We are now coming to realize that, besides progress, there is "regress"; that going forward is no more "natural" than going backward; lastly, that both movements are secondary phenomena, depending primarily upon the character of human stocks.

Now, when we realize the inevitable discontent of individuals or groups placed at cultural levels above their inborn capacities and their instinctive desire to revert from these uncongenial surroundings to others lower but more congenial, we can begin to appreciate the power of the atavistic forces forever seeking to disrupt advanced societies and drag them down to more primitive levels. The success of such attempts means one of those cataclysms known as social revolution, and we have already shown how profound is the regression and how great the destruction of both social and racial values. We must remember, however, that revolutions do not spring casually out of nothing. Behind the revolution itself there usually lies a long formative period during which the forces of chaos gather while the forces of order decline. Revolutions thus give plenty of waning of their approach—for those who have ears to hear. It is only because hitherto men have not understood revolutionary phenomena that the danger-signals have been disregarded and society has been caught unawares.

The symptoms of incipient revolution can be divided into three stages: (1) Destructive criticism of the existing order; (2) revolutionary theorizing and agitation; (3) revolutionary action. The second and third stages will be discussed in subsequent chapters. In the present chapter let us consider the first stage: Destructive Criticism.

Strong, well-poised societies are not overthrown by revolution. Before

the revolutionary onslaught can have any chance of success, the social order must first have been undermined and morally discredited. This is accomplished primarily by the process of *destructive* criticism. Destructive criticism must clearly be distinguished from constructive criticism. Between the two there is all the difference between a toxin and a tonic. Constructive criticism aims at remedying defects and perfecting the existing order by evolutionary methods. Destructive criticism, on the contrary, inveighs against current defects in a bitter, carping, pessimistic spirit; tends to despair of the existing social order, and either asserts or implies that reform can come only through sweeping changes of a revolutionary character. Precisely what the destined goal is to be is, at the start, seldom clearly described. That task belongs to the second stage—the stage of revolutionary theorizing and agitation. Destructive criticism, in its initial aspect, is little more than a voicing of hitherto inarticulate emotions—a preliminary crystallization of waxing dissatisfactions and discontents. Its range is much wider than is commonly supposed, for it usually assails not merely political and social matters but also subjects like art and literature, even science and learning. Always there crops out the same spirit of morose pessimism and incipient revolt against *things as they exist—whatever* these may be.

A fundamental quality of destructive criticism is its glorification of the primitive. Long before it elaborates specific revolutionary doctrines and methods, it blends with its condemnation of the present an idealization of what it conceives to have been the past. Civilization is assumed either to have begun wrong or to have taken a wrong turning at some comparatively early stage of its development. Before that unfortunate event (the source of present ills) the world was much better. Hence, the discontented mind turns back with longing to those pristine halcyon days when society was sound and simple, and man happy and free. The fact that such a Golden Age never really existed is of small moment, because this glorification of the primitive is an emotional reaction of dissatisfied natures yearning for a return to more elemental conditions in which they feel they would be more at

home.

Such is the "Lure of the Primitive." And its emotional appeal is unquestionably strong. This is well illustrated by the popularity of writers like Rousseau and Tolstoy, who have condemned civilization and preached a "return to nature." Rousseau is, in fact, the leading exponent of that wave of destructive criticism which swept over Europe in the latter half of the eighteenth century—the forerunner of the French Revolution; while Tolstoy is one of the leading figures in the similar nineteenth century movement that heralded the revolutionary cataclysms of today. In discussing Rousseau and Tolstoy we will consider not merely their teachings but also their personalities and ancestry, because these latter vividly illustrate what we have already observed—that character and action are mainly determined by heredity.

Take first the case of Rousseau. Jean-Jacques Rousseau is a striking example of the "tainted genius." He was born of unsound stock, his father being dissipated, violent-tempered, flighty, and foolish. Jean-Jacques proved a "chip of the old block," for he was neurotic, mentally unstable, morally weak, sexually perverted, and during the latter part of his life was undoubtedly insane. Together with all this, however, he possessed great literary talents, his style, persuasiveness, and charm captivating and convincing multitudes. He accordingly exerted upon the world a profound—and in the main a baneful—influence, which is working indirectly but powerfully even today. Such was the champion of "noble savagery" against civilization. Rousseau asserted that civilization was fundamentally wrong and that the path of human salvation lay in a "return to nature." According to Rousseau, primitive man was a care-free and wholly admirable creature, living in virtuous harmony with his fellows till corrupted by the restraints and vices of civilization—especially the vice of private property, which had poisoned the souls of all men and had reduced most men to ignoble servitude. It is perhaps needless to add that Rousseau was a passionate believer in "natural equality," all differences between men being in his opinion due solely to the artificial conventions of civilization. If

men would again be happy, free, and equal, asserted Rousseau, the way was easy: let them demolish the fabric of civilization, abolish private property, and return, to his communistic "state of nature."

Put thus baldly, Rousseau's gospel may not sound particularly alluring. Clothed in his own persuasive eloquence, however, it produced an enormous effect. Said Voltaire: "When I read Rousseau, I want to run about in the woods on all fours."

Of course, Rousseau's teaching contains a kernel of soundness—that is true of all false doctrines, since if they were wholly absurd they could make no converts outside of bedlam, and could thus never become dangerous to society. In Rousseau's case the grain of truth was his praise of the beauties of nature and simple living. Preached to the over-sophisticated, artificial "high society" of the eighteenth century, his words undoubtedly produced a refreshing effect; just as a jaded city man today returns invigorated from a month's "roughing it" in the wilds. The trouble was that Rousseau's grain of truth was hidden in a bushel of noxious chaff, so that people were apt to rise from a reading of Rousseau, not inspired by a sane love for simple living, fresh air, and exercise, but inoculated with a hatred for civilization and consumed with a thirst for violent social experiments. The effect was about the same as though our hypothetical city man should return from his month in the wilds imbued with the resolve to burn down his house and spend the rest of his life naked in a cave. In short: "Although Rousseau's injunction, 'Go back into the woods and become men!' may he excellent advice if interpreted as a temporary measure, 'Go back into the woods and remain there' is a counsel for anthropoid apes."

The effect of Rousseau's teaching upon revolutionary thought and action will he discussed later. Let us now turn to the more recent champion of the primitive, Tolstoy. Count Leo Tolstoy came of a distinguished but eccentric stock. His mature philosophy of life, particularly his dislike of civilization and fondness for the primitive, is clearly accounted for by his heredity. The Tolstoys seem to have been noted for a certain wildness of temperament, and one of the family, Feodor Ivanovich Tolstoy, was the famous "American," the "Aleute" of

Griboyedoff, who was so obsessed by Rousseau's teachings that he endeavored to put Rousseauism into practice, had himself tattooed like a savage, and tried to live absolutely in the "state of nature." Leo Tolstoy's life was characterized by violent extremes, ranging from furious dissipation to ascetic frugality and from complete scepticism to boundless religious devotion. Athwart all these shifts, however, we may discern a growing distaste for civilized life as a morbid and unnatural complication, a will to simplify, a metaphysical urge backward toward the condition of primitive man. He repudiates culture and approves all that is simple, natural, elemental, wild. In his writings Tolstoy denounces culture as the enemy of happiness, and one of his works, "The Cossacks," was written specifically to prove the superiority of "the life of a beast of the field." Like his ancestor the tattooed "Aleute," Leo Tolstoy early fell under the spell of Rousseau, and was later deeply influenced by Schopenhauer, the philosopher of pessimism. In his "Confessions" Tolstoy exclaims: "How often have I not envied the unlettered peasant his lack of learning. … I say, let your affairs be as two or three, and not a hundred or a thousand. Instead of a million count half a dozen, and keep your accounts on your thumb nail … Simplify, simplify, simplify! Instead of three meals a day, if it be necessary eat but one, instead of a hundred dishes, five; and reduce other things in proportion."

The celebrated Russian novelist and critic Dimitri Merezhkovski thus analyzes Tolstoy's instinctive aversion to civilization and of the primitive: "If a stone lies on top of another in a desert, that is excellent. If the stone has been placed upon the other by the hand of man, that is not so good. But if stones have been placed upon each other and fixed there with mortar or iron, that is evil; that means construction, whether it be a castle, a barracks, a prison, a customs-house, a hospital, a slaughter-house, a church, a public building, or a school. All that is built is bad, or at least suspect. The first wild impulse which Tolstoy felt when he saw a building, or any complex whole, created by the hand of man, was to simplify, to level, to crush, to destroy, so that no stone might be left upon the other and the place

might again become wild and simple and purified from the work of man's hand. Nature is to him the pure and simple; civilization and culture represent complication and impurity. To return to nature means to expel impurity, to simplify what is complex, to destroy culture."

In analyzing Tolstoy we become aware of a biological problem transcending mere family considerations; the question of Russian folk nature comes into view. The Russian people is made up chiefly of primitive racial strains, some of which (especially the Tartars and other Asiatic nomad elements) are distinctly "wild" stocks which have always shown an Instinctive hostility to civilization. Russian history reveals a series of volcanic eruptions of congenital barbarism which have blown to fragments the thin top-dressing of ordered civilization. Viewed historically, the present Bolshevik upheaval appears largely as an instinctive reaction against the attempt to civilize Russia begun by Peter the Great and continued by his successors. Against this process of "Westernization" the Russian spirit has continually protested. These protests have arisen from all classes of Russian society. Peasant sects like the "Old Believers," condemning Peter as "Antichrist," or, like the Skoptzi, mutilating themselves in furious fanaticism; wild peasant revolts like those of Pugachev and Stenka Razine, reducing vast areas to blood and ashes; high-born "Slavophiles," cursing the "Rotten West," glorifying Asia, and threatening Europe with a "cleansing blood-bath" of conquest and destruction; Bolshevik Commissars longing to engulf the whole world in a Red tide surging out of Moscow—the forms vary, but the underlying spirit is the same. Not by chance have Russians been foremost in all the extreme forms of revolutionary unrest: not by chance was "Nihilism" a distinctively Russian development; Bakunin, the genius of Anarchism; and Lenin, the brains of international Bolshevism.

Dmitri Merezhkovski thus admits the innate wildness of the Russian soul: "We fancied that Russia was a house. No, it is merely a tent. The nomad set up his tent for a brief period, then struck it, and is off again in the steppes. The naked, level steppes are the home of the

wandering Scythian. Wherever in the steppes a black point appears and grows larger in their vision, the Scythian hordes sweep down upon it and level it to the earth. They burn and ravage until they leave the wilderness to resume its sway. The craving for unbroken distances, for a dead level, for naked nature, for physical evenness and metaphysical uniformity—the most ancient ancestral impulse of the Scythian mind—manifests itself equally in Arakcheyev, Bakunin, Pugachev, Razin, Lenin, and Tolstoy. They have converted Russia into a vacant level plan. They would make all Europe the same, and the whole world the same."

Economists have expressed surprise that Bolshevism should have established itself in Russia. To the student of race history, it was a perfectly natural event. Furthermore, while the late war may have hastened the catastrophe, some such catastrophe was apparently inevitable, because for years previous to the war it was clear that the Russian social order was weakening, while the forces of chaos were gathering strength. The decade before the war saw Russia suffering from a chronic "crime wave," known collectively to Russian sociologists as "Hooliganism," which seriously alarmed competent observers. In the year 1912, the Russian minister of the interior, Maklakov, stated: "Crime increases here. The number of cases has grown. A partial explanation is the fact that the younger generation grew up in the years of revolt, 1905-1906. The fear of God and of laws disappears even in the villages. The city and rural population is equally menaced by the 'Hooligans.'" In the following year (1913) a leading St. Petersburg newspaper wrote editorially: "Hooliganism, *as a mass-phenomenon,* is unknown to western Europe. The 'Apaches' who terrorize the population of Paris or London are people with a different psychology from that of the Russian Hooligan." Another St. Petersburg paper remarked about the same time: "Nothing human or divine restrains the destructive frenzy of the untrammelled will of the Hooligan. There are no moral laws for him. He values nothing and recognizes nothing. In the bloody madness of his acts there is always something deeply blasphemous, disgusting, purely bestial." And the

well-known Russian writer, Menshikov, drew this really striking picture of social conditions in the pages of his organ, *Novoye Vremya:* "All over Russia we see the same growth of 'Hooliganism,' and the terror in which the Hooligans hold the population. It is no secret that the army of criminals increases constantly. The Courts are literally near exhaustion, crushed under the weight of a mountain of cases. The police are agonizing in the struggle with crime—struggle which is beyond their strength. The prisons are congested to the breaking-point. Is it possible that this terrible thing will not meet with some heroic resistance? A real civil war is going on in the depths of the masses, which threatens a greater destruction than an enemy's invasion. Not 'Hooliganism,' but Anarchy: this is the real name for that plague which has invaded the villages and is invading the cities. It is not only degenerates who enter upon a life of debauch and crime; already the average, normal masses join them, and only exceptionally decent village youths still maintain as much as possible a life of decent endeavor. The younger people, of wine, make a greater show than the elderly peasants and the old men. But the fact is that both the former and the latter are degenerating into a state of savagery and bestiality."

Could there be a better description of that breakdown of the social controls and upsurge of savage instincts which, as we have already seen, characterizes the outbreak of social revolutions? This was precisely what the Russian Nihilists and Anarchists had been preaching for generations. This was what Bakunin had meant in his favorite toast: "To the destruction of all law and order, and the unchaining of evil passions!" For Bakunin, "The People" were the social outcasts—brigands, thieves, drunkards, and vagabonds. Criminals were frankly his favorites. Said he: "Only the proletariat in rags is inspired by the spirit and force of the coming social revolution."

Referring once more to the matter of Russian Hooliganism prior to 1914, there is good ground for believing that the "crime waves" which have afflicted western Europe and America since the war are of a similar nature. Recently a leading American detective expressed his

conviction that the "gunmen," who to-day terrorize American cities, are imbued with social revolutionary feelings and have a more or less instinctive notion that they are fighting the social order. Mr. James M. Beck, solicitor-general of the United States, has lately uttered a similar warning against what he terms "the exceptional revolt against the authority of law," which is taking place to-day. He sees this revolt exemplified not only in an enormous increase of crime but in the current demoralization visible in music, art, poetry, commerce, and social life.

Mr. Beck's last assertion is one which has been made for years by many keen-sighted critics in the literary and artistic worlds. Nothing is more extraordinary (and more ominous) than the way in which the spirit of feverish, and essentially planless, unrest has been bursting forth for the past two decades in every field of art and letters. This unrest has taken many shapes—"Futurism," "Cubism," "Vorticism," "Expressionism," and God knows what. Its spirit, however, is always the same: a fierce revolt against things as they exist, and a disintegrative, degenerative reaction toward primitive chaos. Our literary and artistic malcontents have no constructive ideas to offer in place of that which they condemn. What they seek is absolute "freedom." Hence, everything which trammels this anarchic "freedom" of theirs—form, style, tradition, reality itself—is hated and despised. Accordingly, all these matters (sneered at as "trite," "old-fashioned," "aristocratic," "bourgeois," or "stupid") are contemptuously cast aside, and the "liberated" soul soars forth on the unfettered pinions of his boundless fancy.

Unfortunately, the flight seems to lead backward toward the jungle past. Certainly the products of the "new" art bear a strange likeness to the crude efforts of degenerate savages. The distorted and tormented shapes of "expressionist" sculpture, for example, resemble (if they resemble anything) the idols of West African negroes. As for "expressionist" painting, it seems to bear no normal relation to anything at all. Those crushed, mutilated forms, vaguely discerned amid a riot of shrieking colors; surely this is not "real"—unless bedlam

be reality! Most extraordinary of all is that ultra-modern school of "painting," which has largely discarded paint in favor of materials like newspaper clippings, buttons, and fish-bones, pasted, sewn or tacked on its canvases.

Almost as extravagant is the "new" poetry. Structure, grammar, metre, rhyme—are defied. Rational meanings are carefully avoided, a senseless conglomeration of words being apparently sought after as an end in itself. Here, obviously, the revolt against form is well-nigh complete. The only step which seemingly now remains to be taken is to abolish language, and have "poems without words."

Now, what does all this mean? It means simply one more phase of the world-wide revolt against civilization by the unadaptable, inferior, and degenerate elements, seeking to smash the irksome framework of modern society, and revert to the congenial levels of chaotic barbarism or savagery. Normal persons may be inclined to laugh at the vagaries of our artistic and literary rebels, but the popular vogue they enjoy proves them to be really no laughing matter. Not long ago the English poet Alfred Noyes warned earnestly against the wide-spread harm done by "Literary Bolsheviki." "We are confronted to-day," he said, "by the extraordinary spectacle of 10,000 literary rebels, each chained to his own solitary height, and each chanting the same perennial song of hate against everything that has been achieved by past generations. The worst of it is that the world applauds them. The real rebel to-day is the man who stands by unpopular truth; but that man has a new name—he is called 'commonplace.' The literary Bolshevism of the past thirty years is more responsible for the present peril of civilization than is realized. One cannot treat all the laws as if they were mere scraps of paper without a terrible reckoning, and we are beginning to see it to-day.

"It has led to an all-round lowering of standards. Some of the modern writers who take upon themselves to wipe out the best of ancient writers cannot write grammatical English. Their art and literature are increasingly Bolshevist. If we look at the columns of the newspapers we see the unusual spectacle of the political editor desperately

fighting that which the art and literary portions of the paper uphold. In the name of 'reality' many writers are indulging in shabby forms of make-believe and are reducing all reality to ashes." In similar vein, the well-known German art critic, Johannes Volkelt, recently deplored the destructive effects of "expressionist" art and literature. "The demoralization of our attitude and sentiment toward life itself," he writes, "is even more portentous than our declining recognition of artistic form. It is a mutilated, deformed, moron humanity which glowers or drivels at us through expressionist pictures. All they suggest is profound morbidity. Their jaded, unhealthy mood is relieved only by absurdities, and where these cast a ray of light into their rudimentary composition, it is only a broken and joyless one. Likewise, that which repels us most in the poetry of our younger school is its scornful stigmatizing of the past, without giving us anything positive in its place; its pathetic groping in its own self-wreckage; its confused, helpless seeking after some steadfast ideal. The soul is exhausted by its ceaseless chasing after nothing. Is life a shallow joke? A crazy dream? A terrifying chaos? Is there no longer sense in talking of an ideal? Is every ideal self-illusion? These are the questions which drive the soul of to-day aimlessly hither and thither. Calm consciousness of power and mastery, the unaffected glow of health, threaten to become lost sensations. Over-alert self-consciousness associated with a mysterious revival of atavistic bestiality, and extreme over-refinement hand in hand with slothful love of indolence, characterize the discord which clouds the artistic mind of the period."

As might be expected, the spirit of revolt which attacks simultaneously institutions, customs, ideals, art, literature, and all the other phases of civilization does not spare what stands behind, namely: individuality and intelligence. To the levelling gospel of social revolution such things are anathema. In its eyes it is the mass, not the individual, which is precious; it is quantity, not quality, which counts. Superior intelligence is by its very nature suspect—it is innately aristocratic, and as such must be summarily dealt with. For the past two decades the whole trend of revolutionary doctrine has been toward a glorification of

brawn over brain, of the hand over the head, of emotion over reason. This trend is so bound up with the development of revolutionary theory and practice that we had best consider it in the chapters devoted to those matters. Suffice it here to state that it is a normal part of proletarian philosophy, and that it aims at nothing short of the entire destruction of modern civilization and the substitution of a self-directed "proletarian culture." Above all, the onward march of our hateful civilization must be stayed. On this point proletarian extremists and "moderates" appear to be agreed. Cries the "Menshevik" Gregory Zilboorg: "Beyond all doubt the progress of Western European civilization has already made life unbearable . … We can achieve salvation to-day only by stopping progress!"

Yes, yes: "civilization is unbearable," "progress must be stopped," "equality must be established," and so forth, and so forth. The emotional urge behind the revolution is quite clear. Let us now examine precisely what the revolution is, what it means, and how it is proposed to bring it about.

CHAPTER V—THE GROUNDSWELL OF REVOLT

REVOLUTIONARY unrest is not new. Every age has had its discontented dreamers preaching utopia, its fervid agitators urging the overthrow of the existing social order, and its restless rabble stirred by false hopes to ugly moods and violent action. Utopian literature is very extensive, going back to Plato; revolutionary agitators have run true to type since Spartacus; while "proletarian" risings have varied little in basic character from the servile revolts of antiquity and the "jacqueries" of the Middle Ages down to the mob upheavals of Paris and Petrograd.

In all these social revolutionary phenomena there is nothing essentially novel. There is always the same violent revolt of the unadaptable, inferior, and degenerate elements against civilized society, in atavistic reaction to lower planes; the same hatred of superiors and fierce desire for absolute equality; finally, the same tendency of revolutionary leaders to become tyrants and to transform anarchy into barbarous despotism.

As Harold Cox justly remarks; "Jack Cade, as described by Shakespeare, is the perfect type of revolutionary, and his ideas coincide closely with those of the modern school of Socialism. He tells his followers that 'all the realm shall be in common,' that 'there shall be no money; all shall eat and drink on my score and I will apparel them all in one livery that they may agree like brothers. A little later a member of the bourgeoisie is brought before him—a clerk who confesses that he can read and write. Jack Cade orders him at once to be hanged 'with his pen and inkhorn about his neck.' Possibly the intellectual Socialists of Great Britain might hesitate at this point; the danger would be getting uncomfortably near to themselves. But the Russian Bolsheviks have followed Jack Cade's example on a colossal scale. In another direction Jack Cade was a prototype of present-day revolutionists; for while preaching equality he practised autocracy. 'Away,' he cries to the mob. 'Burn all the records of the realm. My mouth shall be the Parliament of England.'"

Nevertheless, despite its lack of basic originality the revolutionary

unrest of modern times is very different from, and infinitely more formidable than, the kindred movements of the past. There is to-day a close alliance between the theoretical and the practical elements, a clever fitting of means to ends, a consistent elaboration of plausible doctrines and persuasive propaganda, and a syndication of power, such as was never known before. In former times revolutionary theorists and men of action were unable or unwilling to get together. The early utopian philosophers did not write for the proletariat, which in turn quite ignored their existence. Furthermore, most of the utopians, however revolutionary in theory, were not revolutionary in practice. They seldom believed in violent methods. It is rather difficult to imagine Plato or Sir Thomas More planning the massacre of the bourgeoisie or heading a dictatorship of the proletariat. In fact, so convinced were these utopian idealists of the truth of their theories that they believed that if their theories were actually put in practice on even a small scale they would be a prodigious success and would thus lead to the rapid transformation of society without any necessity of violent coercion. Such was the temper of the "idealistic Socialists and Communists of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, like Robert Owen, who founded various "model communities" believing implicitly that these would soon convert the whole world by the mere force of their example.

Thus, down to comparatively recent times, the cause of violent social revolution lacked the support of leaders combining in themselves the qualities of moral earnestness, intelligence, and forcefulness—in other words persons most of whom belong to the type which I have previously described as the "misguided superior." Deprived of such leadership, revolutionary unrest was mainly guided by unbalanced fanatics or designing scoundrels and it is obvious that such leaders, whatever their zeal or cleverness, were so lacking in intellectual poise or moral soundness that they invariably led their followers to speedy disaster.

The modern social revolutionary movement dates from about the middle of the eighteenth century. Ever since that time there has been

flowing a continuous stream of subversive agitation, assuming many forms but essentially the same, and ever broadening and deepening until it has become the veritable flood which has submerged Russia and which threatens to engulf our entire civilization. Its most noteworthy achievement has been the working out of a revolutionary philosophy and propaganda so insidiously persuasive as to wield together many innately diverse elements into a common league of discontent inspired by a fierce resolve to overthrow by violence the existing social order and to construct a whole new "proletarian" order upon its ruins.

Let us trace the stream of social revolt from its eighteenth-century source to the present day. Its first notable spokesman was Rousseau, with his denunciation of civilized society and his call for a reform to what he considered to be the communistic "state of nature." The tide set flowing by Rousseau and his ilk presently foamed into the French Revolution. This cataclysmic event was, to be sure, by no means a simon-pure social revolt. At the start it was mainly a political struggle by an aspiring bourgeoisie to wrest power and privilege from the feeble hands of a decrepit monarchy and an effete aristocracy. But in the struggle the bourgeoisie called upon the proletariat, the flood-gates of anarchy were opened and there followed that blood-smeared debauch of atavistic savagery, "The Reign of Terror." During the Terror all the symptoms of social revolution appeared in their most horrid form: up-surge of bestiality, senseless destruction, hatred of superiors, ruthless enforcement of levelling "equality," etc. The most extravagant political and social doctrines were proclaimed. Brissot urged communism and announced that "property is theft." Robespierre showed his hatred of genius and learning by sending the great chemist Lavoisier to the guillotine with the remark: "Science is aristocratic: the Republic has no need of savants." As for Anarchists Clootz, Hebert, and other demagogues, they preached doctrines which would have reduced society to a cross between chaos and bedlam.

After a few years the Terror was broken. The French race was too fundamentally sound to tolerate for long such a hideous dictatorship of

its worst elements. The destruction wrought by the Revolution was, however, appalling. Not merely was France dealt wounds from which she has never wholly recovered, but also spirits of unrest were liberated which have never since been laid. The "apostolic succession" of revolt has remained unbroken. Marat and Robespierre are to-day reincarnate in Trotzky and Lenin.

The final eruption of the waning Terror was the well-known conspiracy of Babeuf in the year 1796. This conspiracy, together with the personality of its leader and namesake, is of more than passing interest. Babeuf, like so many other revolutionary leaders of all periods, was a man whose undoubted talents of intellect and energy were perverted by a taint of insanity. His intermittent fits of frenzy were so acute that at times he was little better than a raving homicidal maniac. Nevertheless, his revolutionary activities were so striking and his doctrines so "advanced" that subsequent revolutionists have hailed him as a man "ahead of his times." The Bolshevik "Third International," for example, in its first manifesto, paid tribute to Babeuf as one of its spiritual fathers.

That this Bolshevik compliment was not undeserved is proved by a study of his famous conspiracy. Therein Babeuf planned nothing less than the entire destruction of the existing social order, a general massacre of the "possessing classes," and the erection of a radically new "proletarian" order founded on the most rigid and leveling equality. Not merely were differences of wealth and social station to be prohibited, but even intellectual differences were to be discouraged, because it was feared that "men might devote themselves to sciences, and thereby grow vain and averse to manual labor."

Babeuf's incendiary spirit is well revealed in the following lines, taken from his organ, *Le Tribun du Peuple:* "Why does one speak of laws and property? Property is the share of usurpers and laws are the work of the strongest. The sun shines for every one, and the earth belongs to no one. Go, then, my friends, and disturb, overthrow, and upset this society which does not suit you. Take everywhere all that you like.

Superfluity belongs by right to him who has nothing. This is not all, friends and brothers. If constitutional barriers are opposed to your generous efforts, overthrow without scruple barriers and constitutions. Butcher without mercy tyrants, patricians, and the gilded million, all those immoral beings who would oppose your common happiness. You are the people, the true people, the only people worthy to enjoy the good things of this world! The justice of the people is great and majestic as the people itself; all that it does is legitimate, all that it orders is sacred."

Babeuf's plans can be judged by the following extracts from his "Manifesto of the Equals," which he drew up on the eve of his projected insurrection:

> "People of France, for fifteen centuries you have lived in slavery and consequent unhappiness. For six years you have hardly drawn breath, waiting for independence, happiness, and equality. Equality! the first desire of nature, the first need of man, the principal bond of all legal association!
>
> Well! We intend henceforth to live and die equal as we were born; we wish for real equality or death; that is what we must have. And we will have this real equality no matter at what price. Woe to those who interpose themselves between it and us! … The French Revolution is only the forerunner of another revolution, very much greater, very much more solemn, which will be the last. … Equality! We will consent to anything for that, to make a clean sweep so as to hold to that only. Perish, if necessary, all the arts, provided that real equality is left to us! … Community of Goods! No more private property in land, the land belongs to no one. We claim, we wish for the communal enjoyment of the fruits of the earth: the fruits of the earth belong to every one …
>
> Vanish at last, revolting distinctions of rich and poor, of great and small, of masters and servants, of governors and governed. Let there be no other difference between men than those of age and sex. Since all have the same needs and the same faculties, let

there be only one education, one kind of food. They content themselves with one sun and air for all; why should not the same portion and the same quality of food suffice for each of them?

People of France, Open your eyes and hearts to the plenitude of happiness; recognize and proclaim with us the REPUBLIC OF EQUALS!"

Such was the plot of Babeuf. The plot completely miscarried, for it was discovered before it was ripe, Babeuf and his lieutenants were arrested and executed, and his disorganized hoodlum followers were easily repressed. Nevertheless, though Babeuf was dead, "Babouvism" lived on, inspired the revolutionary conspiracies of the early nineteenth century, contributed to the growth of Anarchism, and is incorporated in the "Syndicalist" and Bolshevist movements of to-day—as we shall presently see. The modern literature of revolt is full of striking parallels to the lines penned by Babeuf nearly one hundred and thirty years ago.

Despite the existence of some extreme revolutionary factions, the first half of the nineteenth century saw comparatively little violent unrest. It was the period of the "idealistic" Socialists, already mentioned, when men like Robert Owen, Saint-Simon, Fourier, and others were elaborating their utopian philosophies and were founding "model communities" which were expected to convert the world peaceably by the mere contagion of their successful example. The speedy failure of all these Socialistic experiments discouraged the idealists and led the discontented to turn to "men of action" who promised speedier results by the use of force. At the same time the numbers of the discontented were rapidly increasing. The opening decades of the nineteenth century witnessed the triumph of machine industry and "capitalism." As in all times of transition, these changes bore hard on multitudes of people. Economic abuses were rife, and precipitated into the social depths many persons who did not really belong there, thus swelling the "proletariat" to unprecedented proportions while also giving it new leaders of genuine ability.

The cumulation of all this was the revolutionary wave of 1848. To be sure, 1848, like the French Revolution, was not wholly a social revolutionary upheaval; it was largely due to political (especially nationalistic) causes with which this book is not concerned. But, as in 1789, so in 1848, the political malcontents welcomed the aid of the social malcontents, and gave the latter their opportunity. Furthermore, in 1848, as in 1789, Paris was the storm-centre. A galaxy of forceful demagogues like Blanqui, Louis Blanc, and Proudhon roused the Paris mob, attempted to establish a Communistic Republic, and were foiled only after a bloody struggle with the more conservative social elements.

Unlike 1789, however, the social revolutionary movement of 1848 was by no means confined to France. In 1848 organized social revolutionary forces existed in most European countries, and all over Europe these forces promptly drew together and attempted to effect a general social revolution. At this moment appears the notable figure of Karl Marx, chief author of the famous "Communist Manifesto," with its ringing peroration: "Let the ruling classes tremble at a communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Working men of all countries, unite!"

The rise of Karl Marx typifies a new influence which had appeared in the revolutionary movement—the influence of the Jews. Before the nineteenth century the Jews had been so segregated from the general population that they had exerted almost no influence upon popular thought or action. By the year 1848, however, the Jews of western Europe had been emancipated from most of their civil disabilities, had emerged from their ghettos, and were beginning to take an active part in community life. Many Jews promptly adopted revolutionary ideas and soon acquired great influence in the revolutionary movement. For this there were several reasons. In the first place, the Jewish mind, instinctively analytical, and sharpened by the dialectic subtleties of the Talmud, takes naturally to dissective criticism. Again, the Jews, feeling themselves more or less apart from the nations in which they live, tended to welcome the distinctly international spirit of social

revolutionary doctrines. Lastly, the Jewish intellectuals, with their quick, clever intelligence, made excellent revolutionary leaders and could look forward to attaining high posts in the "officers' corps" of the armies of revolt. For all these reasons, then, Jews have played an important part in all social revolutionary movements, from the time of Marx and Engels down to the largely Jewish Bolshevist regime in Soviet Russia to-day.

The revolutionary wave of 1848 soon broke in complete defeat. There followed a period during which radical ideas were generally discredited. Both idealistic and violent methods had been tried and had signally failed. Out of this period of eclipse there gradually emerged two schools of social revolutionary thought: one known as "State Socialism," under the leadership of Marx and Engels; the other, "Anarchism," dominated by Proudhon and Michael Bakunin. These two schools were animated by quite different ideas, drew increasingly apart, and became increasingly hostile to one another. Of course, both schools were opposed to the existing social order and proposed its overthrow, but they differed radically as to the new type of society which was to take its place. Marx and his followers believed in an organized Communism, where land, wealth, and property should be taken out of private hands and placed under the control of the state. The Anarchists, on the other hand, urged the complete abolition of the state, the spontaneous seizure of wealth by the masses, and the freedom of every one to do as he liked, unhampered by any organized social control.

In their actual development, likewise, the two movements followed divergent lines. Anarchism remained an essentially violent creed, relying chiefly upon force and terrorism. Marxian Socialism, as time went on, tended to rely less upon revolutionary violence and more upon economic processes and parliamentary methods. This is shown by the career of Marx himself. Marx started out in life as a violent revolutionist. His "Communist Manifesto" (already cited) reads precisely like a Bolshevik pronunciamento of to-day; and it is, in fact, on Marx's earlier writings that the Bolsheviks largely rely. But, as time

passed, Marx modified his attitude. After the failure of '48, he devoted himself to study, the chief fruit of his intellectual labors being his monumental work, *Capital*. Now, in his researches Marx became saturated with the utopian philosophers of the past, and he presently evolved a utopia of his own. Just as the "idealistic" Socialists of the early nineteenth century believed they had discovered truths which, if applied on even a small scale in "model communities," would inevitably transform society, so Marx came to believe that modern society was bound to work itself out into the Socialist order of his dreams with little or no necessity for violent compulsion except, perhaps, in its last stages.

The core of Marx's doctrine was that modern industrialism, by its very being, was bound rapidly to concentrate all wealth in a very few hands, wiping out the middle classes and reducing both bourgeois and working man to a poverty-stricken proletariat. In other words, he predicted a society of billionaires and beggars. This was to happen within a couple of generations. When it did happen the "wage-slaves" were to revolt, dispossess the capitalists, and establish the Socialist commonwealth. Thus would come to pass the social revolution. But note: this revolution, according to Marx, was (1) sure, (2) soon, (3) easy. In Marx's last stage of capitalism the billionaires would be so few and the beggars so many that the "revolution" might be a mere holiday, perhaps effected without shedding a drop of blood. Indeed, it might conceivably be effected according to existing political procedure; for, once have universal suffrage, and the overwhelming majority of proletarian wage-earners could simply vote the whole new order in.

From all this it is quite obvious that Marxian Socialism, however revolutionary in theory, was largely evolutionary in practice. And this evolutionary trend, already visible in Marx, became even stronger with Marx's successors. Marx himself, despite the sobering effect of his intellectual development, remained emotionally a revolutionist—as shown by his temporary relapse into youthful fervors at the time of the Paris Commune of 1871. This was less true of his colleague Engels, and

still less true of later Socialist leaders—men like Lasalle and Kautsky of Germany, Hyndman of England, and Spargo of America. Such men were "reformist" rather than "revolutionary" Socialists; they were willing to bide their time, and were apt to pin their faith on ballots rather than on barricades. Furthermore, Reformist Socialism did not assail the whole idealistic and institutional fabric of our civilization. For example, it might preach the "class-war," but, according to the Marxian hypothesis, the "working class" was, or soon would be, virtually the entire community. Only a few great capitalists and their hirelings were left without the pale. Again, the "revolution," as seen by the Reformists, was more a taking-over than a tearing-down, since existing institutions, both state and private, were largely to be preserved. As a matter of fact, Reformist Socialism, as embodied in the "Social-Democratic" political parties of Continental Europe, showed itself everywhere a predominantly evolutionary movement, ready to achieve its objectives by installments and becoming steadily more conservative. This was so not merely because of the influence of the leaders but also because of the changing complexion of their following. As Marxian Socialism became less revolutionary and more reformist, it attracted to its membership multitudes of "liberals"—persons who desired to reform rather than to destroy the existing social order, and who saw in the Social-Democratic parties the best political instruments for bringing reforms about.

In fact, Reformist Socialism might have entirely lost its revolutionary character and have become an evolutionary liberal movement, had it not been for two handicaps: the spiritual blight of its revolutionary origin and the numbing weight of Marx's intellectual authority. Socialism had started out to smash modern society by a violent revolution. Its ethics were those of the "class war"; its goal was the "dictatorship of the proletariat"; and its philosophy was the narrow materialistic concept of "economic determinism"—the notion that men are moved solely by economic self-interest. All this had been laid down as fundamental truth by Marx in his *Capital*, which became the infallible bible of Socialism.

Now, this was most unfortunate, because Marx had taken the special conditions of his day and had pictured them as the whole of world history. We now know that the middle decades of the nineteenth century were a very exceptional, transition period, in which society was only beginning to adjust itself to the sweeping economic and social changes which the "Industrial Revolution" had brought about. To-day, most of the abuses against which Marx inveighed have been distinctly ameliorated, while the short-sighted philosophy of immediate self-interest regardless of ultimate social or racial consequences which then prevailed has been profoundly modified by experience and deeper knowledge. We must not forget that when Marx sat down to write *Capital*, modern sociology and biology were virtually unknown, so that Marx believed implicitly in fallacies like the omnipotence of environment and "natural equality"—which, of course, form the philosophic bases of his "economic determinism."

Marx's short-sightedness was soon revealed by the actual course of events, which quickly gave the lie to his confident prophecies. All wealth did not concentrate in a few hands; it remained widely distributed. The middle classes did not perish; they survived and prospered. Lastly, the working classes did not sink into a common hell of poverty and squalor; on the contrary, they became more differentiated, the skilled workers, especially, rising into a sort of aristocracy of labor, with wages and living standards about as high as those of the lesser middle classes—whom the skilled workers came more and more to resemble. In other words, the world showed no signs of getting into the mess which Marx had announced as the prologue to his revolution.

To all this, however, the Socialists were blind. Heedless of reality, they continued to see the world through Marx's spectacles, to quote *Capital*, and to talk in terms of the "class war" and "economic determinism." For the Reformist leaders this was not merely fatuous, it was dangerous as well. Sooner or later their dissatisfied followers would demand the fulfilment of Marx's promises; if not by evolution, then by revolution. That was just what was to happen in the

"Syndicalist" movement at the beginning of the present century. In fact, throughout the later decades of the nineteenth century, Marxian Socialism was a house divided against itself: its Reformist leaders and their liberal followers counselling time and patience; its revolutionary, "proletarian" elements growing increasingly restive and straining their eyes for the Red dawn.

Before discussing Syndicalism, however, let us turn back to examine that other revolutionary movement, Anarchism, which, as we have already seen, arose simultaneously with Marxian Socialism in the middle of the nineteenth century. Of course, the Anarchist idea was not new. Anarchist notions had appeared prominently in the French Revolution, the wilder Jacobin demagogues like Hebert and Clootz preaching doctrines which were Anarchist in everything but name. The launching of Anarchism as a self-conscious movement, however, dates from the middle of the nineteenth century, its founder being the Frenchman Proudhon. Proudhon took up the name "Anarchy" (which had previously been a term of opprobrium even in revolutionary circles) and adopted it as a profession of faith to mark himself off from the believers in State Communism, whom he detested and despised. Proudhon was frankly an apostle of chaos. "I shall arm myself to the teeth against civilization!" he cried. "I shall begin a war that will end only with my life!" Institutions and ideals were alike assailed with implacable fury. Reviving Brissot's dictum, "Property is theft," Proudhon went on to assail religion in the following terms: "God—that is folly and cowardice; God is tyranny and misery; God is evil. To me, then, Lucifer, Satan! whoever you may be, the demon that the faith of my fathers opposed to God and the Church!"

While Proudhon founded Anarchism, he had neither the organizing skill nor the proselyting ability to accomplish important tangible results. His disciples were few, but among them was one who possessed the talents to succeed where his master had failed. This was the celebrated Michael Bakunin. Bakunin is another example of the "tainted genius." Sprung from a Russian noble family, Bakunin early displayed great intellectual brilliancy, but his talents were perverted

by his idle and turbulent disposition, so that he was soon at hopeless outs with society and plunged into the stream of revolution, which presently bore him to the congenial comradeship of Proudhon. As stated in the previous chapter, Bakunin was truly at home only in the company of social rebels, especially criminals and vagabonds, his favorite toast being: "To the destruction of all law and order and the unchaining of evil passions."

In the period after the storm of 1848, Bakunin was busy forming his party. His programme of action can be judged by the following excerpts from his *Revolutionary Catechism*, drawn up for the guidance of his followers. "The revolutionary," states Bakunin, "must let nothing stand between him and the work of destruction. For him exists only one single pleasure, one single consolation, one reward, one satisfaction—the success of the revolution. Night and day he must have but one thought, but one aim—implacable destruction. … If he continues to live in this world, it is only to annihilate it all the more surely." For this reason no reforms are to be advocated; on the contrary, "every effort is to be made to heighten and increase the evil and sorrows which will at length wear out the patience of the people and encourage an insurrection *en masse*."

It is easy to see how Anarchism, with its measureless violence and hatred of any organized social control, should have clashed fiercely with Marxian Socialism, becoming steadily more reformist and evolutionist in character. As a matter of fact, the entire second half of the nineteenth century is filled with the struggle between the two rival movements. In this struggle Socialism was the more successful. The Anarchists made a frantic bid for victory in the Paris Commune of 1871, but the bloody failure of the Commune discredited Anarchism and tightened the Socialist grip over most of Europe. Only in Italy, Spain, and Russia (where Anarchy flourished as "Nihilism") did Anarchism gain anything like preponderance in revolutionary circles.

Nevertheless, Anarchism lived on as a forceful minority movement, displaying its activity chiefly by bomb-throwings and by assassinations of crowned heads or other eminent personages. These outrages were

termed by Anarchists the "Propaganda of the Deed," and were intended to terrorize organized society and arouse the proletariat to emulation at one and the same time. The ultimate aim of the Anarchists was, of course, a general massacre of the "possessing classes." As the Anarchist Johann Most declared in his organ, *Freiheit*, in 1880: "It is no longer aristocracy and royalty that the people intend to destroy. Here, perhaps, but a *coup de grace* or two are yet needed. No; in the coming onslaught the object is to smite the entire middle class with annihilation." A little later the same writer urged: "Exterminate all the contemptible brood! Science now puts means into our hands which make it possible to arrange for the wholesale destruction of the brutes in a perfectly quiet and businesslike fashion." In 1881, an International Anarchist Congress was held at London, attended by all the shining lights of Anarchy, including "philosophical" Anarchists like Prince Kropotkin, and the resolutions then passed throw a somewhat sinister doubt on the "non-violence" assertions of the "philosophical" faction. The resolutions of the Congress stated that the social revolution was to be facilitated by close international action, "The committees of each country to keep up regular correspondence among themselves and with the chief committee for the sake of giving continuous information; and it is their duty to collect money for the purchase of poison and arms, as well as to discover places suitable for the construction of mines, etc. To attain the proposed end, the annihilation of all rulers, ministers of state, nobility, the clergy, the most prominent capitalists, and other exploiters, any means are permissible, and therefore great attention should be given specially to the study of chemistry and the preparation of explosives, as being the most important weapons."

Certain peculiarities in the Anarchist "Propaganda of the Deed," should be specially noted, as they well illustrate the fundamental nature of Anarchist thought. Bakunin taught that every act of destruction or violence is good, either directly by destroying a person or thing which is objectionable, or indirectly by making an already intolerable world worse than before and thus hastening the social

revolution. But, in the business of assassination, it is often better to murder good persons and to spare wicked ones; because, as Bakunin expressed it in his *Revolutionary Catechism*, wicked oppressors are "people to whom we concede life provisionally, in order, that, by a series of monstrous acts, they may drive the people into inevitable revolt." The killing of wicked people implies no really valuable criticism of the existing social order. "If you kill an unjust judge, you may be understood to mean merely that you think judges ought to be just; but if you go out of your way to kill a just judge, it is clear that you object to judges altogether. If a son kills a bad father, the act, though meritorious in its humble way, does not take us much further. But if he kills a good father, it cuts at the root of all that pestilent system of family affection and loving-kindness and gratitude on which the present system is largely based."

Such is the spirit of Anarchism. Now, Anarchism is noteworthy, not only in itself, but also as one of the prime motive forces in that much more important "Syndicalist" movement which we will now consider. The significance of Syndicalism and its outgrowth Bolshevism can hardly be overestimated. It is no exaggeration to say that it is the most terrible social phenomenon that the world has ever seen. In Syndicalism we have for the first time in human history a full-fledged philosophy of the Under-Man—the prologue of that vast revolt against civilization which, with Russian Bolshevism, has actually begun.

If we examine Syndicalism in its mere technical economic aspect, its full significance is not apparent. Syndicalism takes its name from the French word *Syndicat* or "Trades Union," and, in its restricted sense, means the transfer of the instruments of production from private or state ownership into the full control of the organized workers in the respective trades. Economically speaking, Syndicalism is thus a cross between State Socialism and Anarchism. The state is to be abolished, yet a federation of trades-unions, and not anarchy, is to take its place.

Viewed in this abstract, technical sense, Syndicalism does not seem to present any specially startling innovations. It is when we examine the Syndicalists' animating spirit, their general philosophy of life, and the

manner in which they propose to attain their ends, that we realize that we are in the presence of an ominous novelty—the mature philosophy of the Under-Man. This philosophy of the Under-Man is to-day called Bolshevism. Before the Russian Revolution it was known as Syndicalism. But Bolshevism and Syndicalism are basically one and the same thing. Soviet Russia has really invented nothing. It is merely practising what others had been preaching for years—with such adaptations as normally attend the putting of a theory into practice.

Syndicalism, as an organized movement, is primarily the work of two Frenchmen, Femand Pelloutier and Georges Sorel. Of course, just as there were Socialists before Marx, so there were Syndicalists before Sorel. Syndicalism's intellectual progenitor was Proudhon, who, in his writings had clearly sketched out the Syndicalist theory. As for Syndicalism's savage, violent, uncompromising spirit, it is clearly Anarchist in origin, drawing its inspiration not merely from Proudhon but also from Bakunin, Most, and all the rest of that furious company of revolt.

"Revolt!" There is the essence of Syndicalism: a revolt, not merely against modern society but against Marxian Socialism as well. And the revolt was timed. When, at the very end of the nineteenth century, Georges Sorel lifted the rebel banner of Syndicalism, the hour awaited the man. The proletarian world was full of discontent and disillusionment at the long-dominant Marxian philosophy. Half a century had passed since Marx first preached his gospel, and the revolutionary millennium was nowhere in sight. Society had not become a world of billionaires and beggars. The great capitalists had not swallowed all. The middle classes still survived and prospered. Worst of all, from the revolutionary view-point, the upper grades of the working classes had prospered, too. The skilled workers were, in fact, becoming an aristocracy of labor. They were acquiring property and thus growing capitalistic; they were raising their living standards and thus growing bourgeois. Society seemed endowed with a strange vitality! It was even reforming many of the abuses which Marx had pronounced incurable. *When, then, was the proletariat to inherit the*

earth?

The Proletariat! That was the key-word. The van, and even the main body of society, might be fairly on the march, but behind lagged a ragged rear-guard. Here were, first of all, the lower working-class strata—the "manual" laborers in the narrower sense, relatively ill-paid and often grievously exploited. Behind these again came a motley crew, the rejects and misfits of society. "Casuals" and "unemployables," "down-and-outs" and *declasses*, victims of social evils, victims of bad heredity and their own vices, paupers, defectives, degenerates, and criminals—they were all there. They were there for many reasons, but they were all miserable, and they were all bound together by a certain solidarity—a sullen hatred of the civilization from which they had so little to hope. To these people evolutionary, "reformist" Socialism was cold comfort. Then came the Syndicalist, promising, not evolution but revolution; not in the dim future but in the here and now; not a bloodless "taking over" by "the workers," hypothetically stretched to include virtually the whole community, but the bloody "dictatorship" of *The Proletariat* in its narrow, revolutionary sense.

Here, at last, was living hope—hope, and the prospect of revenge! Is it, then, strange that a few short years should have seen revolutionary Socialists, Anarchists, all the antisocial forces of the whole world, grouped under the banner of Georges Sorel? For a time they went under different names: Syndicalists in France, Bolshevists in Russia, "I.W.W.'s" in America; but in reality they formed one army, enlisted for a single war.

Now, what was this war? It was, first of all, a war for the conquest of Socialism as a preliminary to the conquest of society. Everywhere the orthodox Socialist parties were fiercely assailed. And these Syndicalist assaults were very formidable, because the orthodox Socialists possessed no moral lines of defense. Their arms were palsied by the virus of their revolutionary tradition. For, however evolutionary and non-militant the Socialists might have become in practice, in theory they had remained revolutionary, their ethics continuing to be those of

the “class war,” the destruction of the “possessing classes,” and the “dictatorship of the proletariat.”

The American economist, Carver, well describes the ethics of Socialism in the following lines: “Marxian Socialism has nothing in common with idealistic Socialism. It rests, not on persuasion, but on force. It does not profess to believe, as did the old idealists, that if Socialism be lifted up it will draw all men unto it. In fact, it has no ideals; it is materialistic and militant. Being materialistic and atheistic, it makes no use of such terms as right and justice, unless it be to quiet the consciences of those who still harbor such superstitions. It insists that these terms are mere conventionalities; the concepts mere bugaboos invented by the ruling caste to keep the masses under control. Except in a conventional sense, from this crude materialistic point of view there is neither right nor wrong, justice nor injustice, good nor bad. Until people who still believe in such silly notions divest their minds of them, they will never understand the first principles of Marxian Socialism.

“Who creates our ideas of right and wrong?’ asks the Socialist. ‘The ruling class. Why? To insure their domination over the masses by depriving them of the power to think for themselves. We, the proletarians, when we get into power, will dominate the situation; we shall be the ruling caste, and, naturally, shall do what the ruling castes have always done; that is, we shall determine what is right and wrong. Do you ask us if what we propose is just? What do you mean by justice? Do you ask if it is right? What do you mean by right? It will be good for *us*. That is all that right and justice ever did or ever can mean.’”

As Harold Cox remarks: “The Socialist is out to destroy Capitalism, and for that end he encourages or condones conduct which the world has hitherto condemned as criminal. … The real ethics of Socialism are the ethics of war. What the Socialists want is, not progress in the world as we know it, but destruction of that world as a prelude to the creation of a new world of their own imagining. In order to win that end they have to seek the support of every force that makes for disorder, and to appeal to every motive that stimulates class hatred. Their ethical

outlook is the direct reverse of that which has inspired all the great religions of the world. Instead of seeking to attain peace upon earth and good-will among men, they have chosen for their goal universal warfare, and they deliberately make their appeal to the passions of envy, hatred, and malice."

Such are the moral bases of Socialism. To be sure, Marxian Socialism had tended to soft-pedal all this, and had become by the close of the nineteenth century a predominantly pacific, "reformist" movement—in practice. But this peaceful pose had been assumed, not from any ethical change, but because of two practical reasons. In the first place, Marx had taught that society would soon break down through its own defects; that the "possessing classes" would rapidly destroy each other; and that Socialists might thus wait for society's decrepitude before giving it the death-stroke, instead of risking a doubtful battle while it was still strong. In the second place, Socialism, as a proselyting faith, welcomed "liberal" converts, yet realized that these would not "come over" in any great numbers unless it could present a "reformist" face to them.

Reformist Socialism, as it stood at the close of the nineteenth century, thus rested upon equivocal moral foundations. Its policy was based, not upon principle, but upon mere expediency. The Syndicalists saw this, and used it with deadly effect. When the reformist leaders reprobated the Syndicalists' savage violence, the Syndicalists laughed at them, taunted them with lack of courage, and pointed out that morally they were all in the same boat. The Syndicalists demanded that questions of principle be excluded as irrelevant and that the debate should be confined to questions of policy.

And here, again, the Syndicalists had the Socialists on the hip. The Syndicalists argued (justly enough) that Marx's automatic social revolution was nowhere in sight; that society was not on its death-bed; and that, if it was to die soon, it must be *killed*—by the violent methods of social revolution. In fact, the Syndicalists invoked Marx himself to this effect, citing his youthful revolutionary exhortations, uttered before he had evolved the utopian fallacies of *Capital*.

These fallacies, together with all subsequent "reformist" accretions, the Syndicalists contemptuously discarded. The ethics of the "class war" were proclaimed in all their naked brutality. "Compromise" and "evolution" were alike scathingly repudiated. The Syndicalists taught that the first steps toward the social revolution must be the destruction of all friendship, sympathy, or co-operation between classes; the systematic cultivation of implacable class hatred; the deepening of unbridgeable class cleavages. All hopes of social betterment by peaceful political methods were to be resolutely abandoned, attention being henceforth concentrated upon the grim business of the class war.

This war was not to be postponed till some favorable moment; it was to begin *now,* and was to be waged with ever-increasing fury until complete and final victory. According to Georges Sorel: "Violence, class struggles without quarter, the state of war *en permanence*," were to be the birthmarks of the social revolution. As another French Syndicalist, Pouget, expressed it: "Revolution is a work of all moments, of to-day as well as of to-morrow; it is a continuous action, an every-day fight without truce or delay against the powers of extortion."

The methods of the class war were summed up under the term "direct action." These methods were numerous, the most important being the strike and "sabotage." Strikes were to be continually called, for any or no reason; if they failed, so much the better, since the defeated workers would be left in a sullen and vengeful mood. Agreements with employers were to be made only to be broken, because all lies, deceit, and trickery were justifiable—nay, imperative—against the "enemy." Even while on the job, the Syndicalist was never to do good work, was always to do as little work as possible ("ca' canny"), and was to practise "sabotage" *i.e.*, spoil goods and damage machinery, if possible without detection. The objects of all this were to ruin employers, demoralise industry, decrease production, and thus make living conditions so hard that the masses would be roused to hotter discontent and become riper for "mass action."

Meanwhile, everything must be done to envenom the class struggle. Hatred must be deliberately fanned, not only among the masses but among the "possessing classes" as well. Every attempt at conciliation or understanding between combatants weary of mutual injury must be nipped in the bud. Says Sorel: "To repay with black ingratitude the benevolence of those who would protect the worker, to meet with insults the speeches of those who advocate human fraternity, to reply by blows at the advocates of those who would propagate social peace—all this is assuredly not in conformity with the rules of fashionable Socialism, but it is a very practical method of showing the bourgeois that they must mind their own business. … Proletarian violence appears on the stage at the very time when attempts are being made to mitigate conflicts by social peace. Violence gives back to the proletariat their natural weapon of the class struggle, by means of frightening the bourgeoisie and profiting by the bourgeois dastardliness in order to impose on them the will of the proletariat."

The uncompromising, fighting spirit of Syndicalism comes out vividly in the following lines by the American Syndicalist, Jack London:

> "There has never been anything like this revolution in the history of the world. There is nothing analogous between it and the American Revolution or the French Revolution. It is unique, colossal. Other revolutions compare with it as asteroids compare with the sun. It is alone of its kind; the first world revolution in a world whose history is replete with revolutions. And not only this, for it is the first organized movement of men to become a world movement, limited only by the limits of the planet.
>
> This revolution is unlike all other revolutions in many respects. It is not sporadic. It is not a flame of popular discontent, arising in a day and dying down in a day. Here are 7,000,000 comrades in an organized, international, world-wide, revolutionary army. The cry of this army is, 'No quarter! We want all that you possess. We will be content with nothing less than all you possess. We want in our hands the reins of power and the destiny of mankind. Here are our hands. They are strong hands. We are going to take your

governments, your palaces, and all your purpled ease away from you. … The revolution is here, now. Stop it who can.'"

Syndicalism's defiant repudiation of traditional morality is well stated in the following quotations from two leaders of the "I. W. W." ("Industrial Workers of the World"), the chief Syndicalist group in America. The first of these quotations is from the pen of Vincent St. John, and is taken from his booklet, *The I. W. W., Its History, Structure, and Methods*. As Mr. St. John is regarded by Syndicalists everywhere as one of their ablest thinkers, his words may be taken as an authoritative expression of Syndicalist philosophy. Says Mr. St. John: "As a revolutionary organization, the Industrial Workers of the World aim to use any and all tactics that will get the results sought with the least expenditure of time and energy. The tactics used are determined solely by the power of the organization to make good in their use. The question of 'right' or 'wrong' does not concern us."

In similar vein, another I. W. W. leader, Arturo Giovannitti, writes: "It is the avowed intention of both Socialists and Industrial Unionists alike to expropriate the bourgeoisie of all its property, to make it social property. Now, may we ask if this is right? Is it moral and just? Of course, if it is true that labor produces everything, it is both moral and just that it should own everything. But this is only an affirmation—it must be proven. *We Industrial Unionists care nothing about proving it*. We are going to take over the industries some day, for three very good reasons: Because we need them, because we want them, and because we have the power to get them. Whether we are 'ethically' justified or not is not our concern. We will lose no time proving title to them beforehand; but we may, if it is necessary, after the thing is done, hire a couple of lawyers and judges to fix up the deed and make the transfer perfectly legal and respectable. Such things can always be fixed—anything that is powerful becomes in due course of time righteous. Therefore we Industrial Unionists claim that the social revolution is not a matter of necessity plus justice, but simply necessity plus strength."

The climax of the class war, as conceived by the Syndicalists, is the

"general strike." Having sufficiently demoralized industry by a long process of "direct action" and having converted enough of the workers for their purpose, the Syndicalists will call the general strike. Before leaving the factories the workers will destroy the machinery by wholesale *sabotage*; the railways and other forms of transport will likewise be ruined; and economic life will thus be completely paralyzed. The result will be chaos, which will give the Syndicalists their opportunity. In that hour the organized Syndicalist minority, leading the frenzied, starving masses, and aided by criminals and other antisocial elements, will overthrow the social order, seize all property, crush the bourgeoisie, and establish the social revolution.

This social revolution is to be for the benefit of *the Proletariat* in its most literal sense. Syndicalism hates, not merely capitalists and bourgeois, but also the "intellectuals" and even the skilled workers —"the aristocracy of labor." Syndicalism is instinctively hostile to intelligence. It pins its faith to *instinct*—that "deeper knowledge" of the undifferentiated human mass; that proletarian *quantity* so much more precious than individualistic *quality*. Both the intellectual elite and their works must make room for the "proletarian culture" of the morrow. Intellectuals are a "useless, privileged class"; art is "a mere residuum bequeathed to us by an aristocratic society." (1) Science is likewise condemned. Cries the French Syndicalist, Edouard Berth, in his pamphlet significantly entitled, *The Misdeeds of the Intellectuals*: "Oh, the little science—*la petite science*—which feigns to attain the truth by attaining lucidity of exposition, and shirks the obscurities. Let us go back to the subconscious, the psychological source of every inspiration!"

Here we see the full frightfulness of Syndicalism/Bolshevism! This new social revolt, prepared a generation ago and launched in Soviet Russia, is not merely a war against a social system, not merely a war against our civilization; *it is a war of the hand against the brain*. For the first time since man was man there has been a definite schism between the hand and the head. Every progressive principle which mankind has thus far evolved: the solidarity of civilization and culture; community of

interest; the harmonious synthesis of muscle, intellect and spirit—all these the new heresy of the Under-Man howls down and tramples in the mud. Up from the dark purlieus of the underworld strange battle-shouts come winging. The underworld is to become *the* world, the *only* world. As for *our* world, it is to be destroyed; as for *us*, we are to be killed. A clean sweep! Not even the most beautiful products of our intellects and souls interest these Under-Men. Why should they care when they are fashioning a world of their own? A *hand*-world, not a *head*-world. The Under-Men despise thought itself, save as an instrument of invention and production. Their guide is, not reason, but the "proletarian truth" of instinct and passion—the deeper self below the reason, whose sublimation is—the mob. Spake Georges Sorel: "Man has genius only in the measure that he does not think."

The citizens of the upper world are to be extirpated along with their institutions and ideals. The doomed classes are numerous. They comprise not merely the billionaires of Marx, but also the whole of the upper and middle classes, the landowning country folk, even the skilled working men; in short, all except those who work with their untutored hands, *plus* the elect few *who philosophize for* those who work with their untutored hands. The elimination of so many classes is, perhaps, unfortunate. However, it is necessary, because these classes are so hopelessly capitalist and bourgeois that, unless eliminated, they would surely infect at its very birth the gestating underworld civilization.

Now, note one important point. All that I have just said applies to Syndicalism as it stood prior to the Russian Revolution of 1917. Every point that I have treated has been drawn from Syndicalist pronouncements made before the appearance of "Bolshevism." We must recognize once and for all that Bolshevism is not a peculiar Russian phenomenon, but that it is merely the Muscovite manifestation of a movement which had formulated its philosophy and infected the whole civilized world before the beginning of the late war. Thus, when in the next chapter we come to contemplate Russian Bolshevism in action, we shall view it, not as a purely Russian problem, but as a local

phase of something which must be faced, fought, and mastered in every quarter of the earth.

CHAPTER VI—THE REBELLION OF THE UNDER-MAN

THE Russian Bolshevik Revolution of November, 1917, is an event whose significance increases with the lapse of time. It is the opening gun of the organized rebellion against civilization. Hitherto the proletarian movement had been either "in the air" or underground. Proletarian dreamers might formulate doctrines; proletarian strategists might plan campaigns; proletarian agitators might rouse wide-spread unrest and incite sporadic violence. Yet all this, though ominous for the future, did not menace society with immediate destruction.

The Bolshevik Revolution, however, produced a radically new situation, not merely for Russia, but also for the whole world. Falling from the clouds and rising from the cellars, the forces of unrest coalesced in open line of battle, provided with a huge base of operations, vast resources, and great material fighting strength. To have acquired at a stroke the mastery of mighty Russia, covering nearly one-sixth of the whole land-surface of the globe and inhabited by fully 150,000,000 human souls, was a material asset of incalculable value. And the moral gains were equally important. "Nothing succeeds like success"; so the triumph of the Russian Bolsheviks set revolutionists everywhere aquiver, firing their blood, inflaming their "will to power," and nerving their hearts to victory.

The Bolshevik triumph in Russia had, it is true, been won by numerically slender forces, the numbers of convinced Bolsheviks who formed the ruling "Communist Party" numbering only about 500,000 or 600,000 out of a population of 150,000,000. But this was really a powerful stimulant to the "world revolution," because it proved the ability of a determined, ruthless minority to impose its will upon a disorganized society devoid of capable leaders, and thus encouraged revolutionary minorities everywhere to hope that they might do the same thing—especially with the Russian backing upon which they could henceforth rely. As a matter of fact, Bolshevik revolutions have been tried in many lands since 1917, were actually successful for short periods in Hungary and Bavaria, and are certain to be attempted in the

future, since in every part of the world Bolshevik agitation is persistently and insidiously going on.

The Russian Bolshevik Revolution took most of the world by surprise—particularly the orthodox Socialists, heedful of Marx's prophecy that the revolution would begin in ultra-capitalist countries, and not in economically backward lands like Russia, barely out of the agricultural stage. To those who realize the true nature of social revolution and the special characteristics of Russian life, however, the outbreak of social revolution in Russia rather than in Western countries is precisely what might have been expected. Social revolution, as we have already seen, is not progress but regress; not a step forward to a higher order, but a lurch backward to a lower plane. Therefore, countries like Russia, with veneers of civilization laid thinly over instinctive wildness and refractory barbarism, are peculiarly liable to revolutionary atavism.

Furthermore, we have seen that the Russian Bolshevik Revolution was not a chance happening but the logical outcome of a process of social disintegration and savage resurgence that had long been going on. For more than half a century the "Nihilists" had been busily fanning the smouldering fires of chaos, their methods and aims being alike frankly described by one of their number, Dostoievsky, who wrote fully fifty years ago: "To reduce the villages to confusion, to spread cynicism and scandals, together with complete disbelief in everything and eagerness for something better, and finally by means of fires to reduce the country to desperation! Mankind has to be divided into two unequal parts: nine-tenths have to give up all individuality and become, so to speak, a herd. … We will destroy the desire for property; we will make use of drunkenness, slander, spying; we will make use of incredible corruption; we will stifle every genius in his infancy. We will proclaim destruction. There is going to be such an upset as the world has never seen before."

The growing power of the violent subversive elements showed clearly in the course of the Russian Revolution of 1905. That movement was not primarily a social revolution; it was at first a political revolution, directed by the "Intelligentsia" and the liberal bourgeoisie, against the

corrupt and despotic Czarist autocracy. No sooner was the Czarist regime shaken, however, than the social revolutionists tried to take over the movement and turn it to their own ends. It is instructive to remember that, in the Social Revolutionary Party Congress of 1903, the extremists had gained control of the party machinery, and were thenceforth known as "Bolsheviki," dominating the less violent "Menshevik" wing. The leader of this successful *coup* was none other than Nikolai Lenin. Therefore, when the revolution of 1905 broke out, the social revolutionists, under the leadership of Lenin, were pledged to the most violent action.

It was in the autumn of 1905, about six months after the beginning of the political revolution, that the Bolsheviki attempted to seize control by proclaiming a "dictatorship of the proletariat," organized into "Soviets." The attempt, however, failed; but this abortive *coup* of the social revolutionists involved the failure of the whole revolutionary movement. Frightened by the spectre of class warfare and social chaos, the political revolutionists cooled, Czarism rallied and re-established its authority. Russia's hope of a liberal, constitutional government faded away, and Czarism continued in the saddle until the Revolution of March, 1917.

This second revolution was almost an exact replica of the first. At the start it was dominated by political reformers—liberals like Mihukov and Prince Lvov, allied with moderate Socialists like Kerensky. Behind the scenes, however, the Bolsheviki were working. Both their tactics and their leaders were the same as those of 1905, and this time their efforts were crowned with success. In November, 1917, eight months after the outbreak of the Second Russian Revolution, came the Third, or Bolshevik, Revolution, the crushing of both political liberals and moderate Socialists, and the triumph of violent Communism. Russia sank into the hell of class war, bloodshed, terrorism, poverty, cold, disease, and appalling famine in which it has been weltering ever since. Furthermore, "Red Russia" appeared like a baleful meteor on the world's horizon. The Bolshevik leaders promptly sought to use Russia as a lever for upsetting the whole world and supplemented their

national organization by the “Third International,” whose revolutionary tentacles soon stretched to the remotest corners of the earth.

Into a detailed discussion of Bolshevism’s horrors and failures I do not propose to enter. It would fill a book in itself. Suffice it here to say that Bolshevism’s so called “constructive” aims have failed, as they were bound to fail, for the simple reason that Bolshevism is essentially a destructive, retrogressive movement. To be sure, the economic breakdown in Russia has been so frightful that, in order to avert utter chaos, the Bolshevik leaders have been forced to revive some of the despised “capitalist” methods, such as private trading, the employment of high-salaried experts, and certain forms of private property. They have also attempted to stimulate production by establishing an iron despotism over the workers, forcing the latter to labor virtually as slaves, so that the Bolshevist regime has come to be known sardonically as a “dictatorship *over* the proletariat.” Perhaps these measures may save Russia from absolute ruin; perhaps not. Time alone will tell. But even if things now take a turn for the better, this will be due, not to Bolshevism but to a *practical* repudiation of Bolshevism by its own leaders. It is by its doctrines, and by its acts done in accordance with those doctrines, that Bolshevism must be judged. Let us see, then, what Russian Bolshevism means, in theory and in applied practice.

The fundamental characteristic of Bolshevism is its *violence*. Of course, this was also a basic element in Syndicalism, but the Bolshevists seem to stress violence even more than their Syndicalist predecessors. Bolshevism calmly assumes wholesale class warfare of the most ferocious character on a world-wide scale for an indefinite period, as a normal phase of its development and as necessary for its success. For example: the American journalist, Arthur Ransome, in his conversations with the Russian Bolshevik leaders, found them contemplating a “period of torment” for the world at large lasting at least fifty years. The class wars which would rage in western Europe and America would be infinitely worse than Russia’s, would annihilate

whole populations, and would probably imply the destruction of all culture.

The appalling implications of this Bolshevik principle of "permanent violence" have repelled not merely believers in the existing social order, but also many persons not wholly hostile to Bolshevism and even ready to welcome a social revolution of a less destructive character. The "Menshevik" Gregory Zilboorg thus criticises Bolshevism's "mob-psychology" (and incidentally expounds the Menshevik theory of revolution) in the following lines:

> "The Bolshevists have an almost religious, almost frantic faith in the masses as such. Dynamic masses are their ideal. But they overlooked, and still overlook, the fact that the masses, even the self-conscious masses, are often transformed into mobs, and the dynamic power of a mob may scarcely be reasoned with …
>
> The fallacy in the Bolshevist reasoning lies in including people as well as mob in the term 'masses.' The blind faith in the 'masses' is a silent but potent indication that they accept the crowd and the crowd psychology as the most justifiable factors in social life. Such an acceptance implies the further acceptance of two very dangerous factors. The first is that revolution is a blow, a moment of spontaneous destruction. Immediately following this blow there arises the necessity for stabilizing the social forces for a constructive life. I take it that the work of construction must begin, not when we have reached a point beyond which we cannot go, but when we have completely changed the social element. As soon as the old codes, as a system, are done with, we must give up destroying and turn to constructing. For this purpose we must gather all our intellectual forces, relying on the masses to help us, but not being guided by them. So that when a revolution puts power into the hands of a group or a class, even dictatorial power, we must immediately begin to solidarize the social forces. The Communist theory omits the necessity for this solidarization, and, therefore, admits of no compromise or co-operation. It creates fundamental principles of a rule by a

> minority. Government by a minority is dangerous, not because it is opposed to the traditional idea of democracy and the traditional worship of the majority, but because such government necessitates the employment of continuous violent methods and maintaining continuously, in the minds of the masses, a consciousness of danger and the necessity for destruction. And that is the second dangerous factor. Under such a condition the masses are permanent mobs, able only to hate, to fight, and to destroy."

In similar vein, President Masaryk of Czechoslovakia (himself a moderate Socialist) asserts that "The Bolsheviki want revolution at any cost," and continues: "Lenin considers armed revolution the principal constructive force in social progress: For the Bolsheviki, revolution is a revelation, and for most of them it is literally a fetish. Consequently, to their eyes, revolution is an end in itself. … The Bolsheviki did not know, and they never have known, how to work. They know only how to force others to work. They know how to fight, how to kill, and murder, and die, but they are incapable of plodding, productive labor."

It was the terrible "price" of prolonged, world-wide warfare that made the celebrated English thinker, Bertrand Russell, reject Bolshevism, to which he had at first been strongly attracted. "Those who realize the destructiveness of the late war," he writes, "the devastation and impoverishment, the lowering of the level of civilization throughout vast areas, the general increase of hatred and savagery, the letting loose of bestial instincts which had been curbed during peace—those who realize all this will hesitate to incur inconceivably greater horrors even if they believe firmly that Communism in itself is much to be desired. An economic system cannot be considered apart from the population which is to carry it out; and the population resulting from such a world war as Moscow calmly contemplates would be savage, bloodthirsty and ruthless to an extent that must make any system a mere engine of oppression and cruelty. … I am compelled to reject Bolshevism for two reasons: First, because the price mankind must pay to achieve Communism by Bolshevik

methods is too terrible; and secondly, because, even after paying the price, I do not believe the result would be what the Bolsheviks profess to desire."

In this connection it is instructive to note that the Russian Bolshevik leaders have never repudiated, or even modified, their fundamental reliance upon violent methods. Lenin's famous "Twenty-One Points" Manifesto, laying down the terms upon which Socialist groups throughout the world would be admitted to the "Third International," commands implacable war, open or secret, both against existing society and against all Socialists outside the Communist fold. And Trotzky, in his recent pronouncement significantly entitled, "The Defense of Terrorism," fiercely justifies all Bolshevik acts and policies as alike necessary and right.

Another of Bolshevism's fundamental characteristics is its *despotism*—a despotism not only of the Bolshevist minority over the general population, but also of the Bolshevik leaders over their own followers. Here, again, Bolshevism is merely developing ideas already formulated by Syndicalism. The Syndicalists, abandoning the Marxian deference for "the masses" in general, denied the necessity or desirability for heeding their wishes and considered only the "class-conscious" minority of the proletariat—in plain language, their own crowd. As the French Syndicalist, Lagardelle put it: "The mass, unwieldy and clumsy as it is, must not here speak out its mind." Furthermore, in carrying out their programme, Syndicalist leaders might rely wholly on force, without even condescending to explanation. In the words of the Syndicalist Brouilhet: "The masses expect to be treated with violence, and not to be persuaded. They always obediently follow when a single man or a clique shows the way. Such is the law of collective psychology."

The Russian Bolshevik leaders evidently had these ideas in mind when they made their successful *coup d'etat* in November, 1917. Bolshevik theory, as preached to the masses, had hitherto been that the "dictatorship of the proletariat" would be a short transition period ending with the rapid annihilation of the capitalist and bourgeois

classes, after which there would be no more "government," but a fraternal liberty. That the Bolshevik "dictatorship" might last longer than most proletarians expected was, however, hinted at by Lenin himself in a circular issued shortly before the November *coup,* and entitled, "Shall the Bolsheviks remain in Power?" Here Lenin bluntly states his attitude. Of course, he says, we preached the destruction of the State as long as the State was in possession of our enemies. But why should we destroy the State after having ourselves taken the helm? The State is, to be sure, an organised rule by a privileged minority. Well, let us in our turn substitute *our* minority for theirs, and let us run the machinery!

And this is precisely what the Bolsheviks have done. Instead of destroying the State, they have built up one of the most iron despotisms that the world has ever seen, with an autocratic governing clique functioning through a centralized "Red" bureaucracy and relying upon a "Red" army powerful enough to crush all disaffection. No parliamentary opposition, no criticism, is permitted. No book, pamphlet, or newspaper may be printed which disagrees with the Bolshevik Government. Furthermore, there are no signs of any relaxation of this despotic attitude. The recent "concessions" like private trading are purely *economic* in character; the Bolshevik Government itself has frankly announced that no *political* concessions will be made, and that absolute power will remain in its hands. The economic concessions are termed merely "temporary" to be revoked as soon as the Russian people has become sufficiently "educated" along Bolshevik lines to make possible the establishment of pure Communism.

Of course, this means that the "dictatorship" is to be indefinitely prolonged. As Lenin himself candidly remarked recently to a visiting delegation of Spanish Socialists: "We never spoke about liberty. We practise the proletariat's dictatorship in the name of the minority, because the peasant class have not yet become proletarian and are not with us. It will continue until they subject themselves."

But would the dictatorship end even if the whole Russian people

should "subject themselves" to Communism? It is highly improbable. On this point Bertrand Russell makes some very acute remarks, the result of his journey to Russia, and keen "sizing-up" of its Bolshevist rulers. Says Mr. Russell:

> "Advocacy of Communism by those who believe in Bolshevik methods rests upon the assumption that there is no slavery except economic slavery, and that when all goods are held in common there must be perfect liberty. I fear this is a delusion.
>
> There must be administration, there must be officials who control distribution. These men, in a Communist State, are the repositories of power. So long as they control the army, they are able, as in Russia at this moment, to wield despotic power, even if they are a small minority. The fact that there is Communism—to a certain extent—does not mean that there is liberty. If the Communism were more complete it would not necessarily mean more freedom; there would still be certain officials in control of the food-supply, and those officials could govern as they pleased as long as they retained the support of the soldiers. This is not mere theory; it is the patent lesson of the present condition of Russia. The Bolshevik theory is that a small minority are to seize power, and are to hold it until Communism is accepted practically universally, which, they admit, may take a long time. But power is sweet, and few men surrender it voluntarily. It is especially sweet to those who have the habit of it, and the habit becomes most ingrained in those who have governed by bayonets without popular support. Is it not almost inevitable that men placed as the Bolsheviks are placed in Russia (and as they maintain that the Communists *must* place themselves wherever the social revolution succeeds) will be loath to relinquish their monopoly of power, and will find reasons for remaining until some new revolution ousts them? Would it not be fatally easy for them, without altering the economic structure, to decree large salaries for high government officials, and so reintroduce the old inequalities of wealth? What motive would they have for not

> doing so? What motive is possible except idealism, love of mankind—non-economic motives of the sort that Bolsheviks decry? The system created by violence and the forcible rule of a minority must necessarily allow of tyranny and exploitation; and if human nature is what Marxists assert it to be, why should the rulers neglect such opportunities of selfish advantage?
>
> It is sheer nonsense to pretend that the rulers of a great empire such as Soviet Russia, when they have become accustomed to power, retain the proletarian psychology, and feel that their class interest is the same as that of the ordinary working man. This is not the case in fact in Russia now, however the truth may be concealed by fine phrases. The government has a class consciousness and a class interest quite distinct from those of the genuine proletarian, who is not to be confounded with the paper proletarian of the Marxian schema."

Thus, in Russia as in social revolutions throughout history, we see emerging the vicious circle of chaos succeeded by despotism. There is the tragedy of social upheavals—the upshot being that the new ruling class is usually inferior to the old, while society has meantime suffered irreparable cultural and racial losses.

How, indeed, can it be otherwise? Let us look once more at Russia. Consider, first of all, the Bolshevik leaders. Some of them, like Lenin, are really able men, but most of them appear to belong to those sinister types ("tainted geniuses," paranoiacs, unbalanced fanatics, unscrupulous adventurers, clever criminals, etc.) who always come to the front in times of social dissolution—which, indeed, give them their sole opportunity of success. In fact, this has been admitted by no less a person than Lenin himself. In one of his extraordinary bursts of frankness, he remarked in his speech before the Third Soviet Conference, "Among one hundred so-called Bolsheviki—there is one real Bolshevik, with thirty-nine criminals and sixty fools."

It would be extremely instructive if the Bolshevik leaders could all be psychoanalyzed. Certainly, many of their acts suggest peculiar mental

states. The atrocities perpetrated by some of the Bolshevik Commissars, for example, are so revolting that they seem explicable only by mental aberrations like homicidal mania or the sexual perversion known as sadism.

One such scientific examination of a group of Bolshevik leaders has been made. At the time of the Red terror in the city of Kiev, in the summer of 1919, the medical professors of Kiev University were spared on account of their usefulness to their terrorist masters. Three of these medical men were competent alienists, who were able to diagnose the Bolshevik leaders mentally in the course of their professional duties. Now, their diagnosis was that nearly all the Bolshevik leaders were degenerates, of more or less unsound mind. Furthermore most of them were alcoholics, a majority were syphilitic, while many were drug fiends. Such were the "dictators" who for months terrorized a great city of more than 600,000 inhabitants, committed the most fiendish atrocities, and butchered many leading citizens including scholars of international reputation.

Of course, what is true of the leaders is even truer of the followers. In Russia, as in every other social upheaval, the bulk of the fighting revolutionists consists of the most turbulent and worthless elements of the population, far outnumbering the small nucleus of genuine zealots for whom the revolution is a pure ideal. The original "Red Guard" of Petrograd, formed at the time of the November *coup,* was a most unsavory lot, made up chiefly of army deserters, gunmen, and foreign adventurers, especially Letts from the Baltic Provinces. The Bolshevik leaders from the start deliberately in flamed the worst passions of the city rabble, while the "pauper" elements in the villages were systematically incited against the thriftier peasants. When the Bolshevik Government became firmly established, proletarian violence was controlled and directed against its enemies.

The spirit, however, remained the same—a spirit of wild revolt, of measureless violence, of frenzied hatred of the old order in every form. All glory, honor, and triumph to the revolution; to the fury of the *proletarian will;* to the whirlwind of unfettered brute-action; to the

madness for *doing things!* This spirit is vividly portrayed in Alexander Block's famous poem, *The Twelve*. Block preaches implacable hatred of the old world; of the "lazy bourgeois"; of all that belongs to yesterday, which fancied itself secure and now has become the booty of the Red Guards.

"For the bourgeois woe and sorrow.
We shall start a world-wide fire,
And with blood that fire we'll blend."

The "bourgeois," the middle-class man, is hated even worse than the aristocrat and the great capitalist. This attitude is not peculiar to the Russian Bolsheviks; it is shared by all social revolutionists, both of to-day and of yesterday. In the preceding chapter we have seen how fierce was the hatred of the middle classes among Anarchists and Syndicalists. In Russia it is felt by all the revolutionary parties. Here, for example, is how the Menshevik, Gregory Zilboorg, describes the bourgeoisie: "The great enemy of a genuine revolution is, not capitalism itself, but its by-product, its bastard offspring, the middle class; and as long as the middle class remains intact in Europe, a revolution is not possible. … Materialism demonstrated a certain diabolic genius in creating its faithful servant, the middle class. The rule of the middle class is nothing less than a 'dictatorship of the propertariat.' While that dictature lasts, the new order of society will remain unborn."

Such being the attitude of revolutionists of all shades, the fate of the Russian middle classes after the Bolshevik triumph was a foregone conclusion. As a matter of fact, the Bolsheviks proceeded to shatter this "stumbling block of the revolution" with a ruthless efficiency unparalleled in history. The middle classes were proscribed *en mass*, "Boorjooy" becoming as fatal an epithet in Soviet Russia as "Aristocrat" was in Jacobin France. All over Russia the bourgeois were degraded into persecuted pariahs, systematically fenced off like lepers from the rest of the population and condemned to ultimate extinction as unfit to live in the new Communistic society.

The tragedy that followed baffles description. Multitudes of bourgeois fled beyond the frontiers. Other multitudes scattered across Russia as homeless refugees. The bravest joined the "White" armies and fell fighting in the civil wars. The rest huddled in their desolate homes, like condemned criminals waiting for death exposed to every hardship and ignominy that their persecutors could heap upon them. The most effective means devised by the Bolsheviks for "eliminating" the bourgeoisie was the "differential food ration." The population was graded by classes and rationed accordingly, members of the Communist Party faring best, while "Boorjooy" received least of all—in Lenin's jocose phraseology, "bread enough to prevent them from forgetting its smell." Their official ration being quite in-sufficient to sustain life, the bourgeois eked out a wretched existence by bartering to food-smugglers such of their goods as had not been seized or stolen, and when these were gone—starved.

The result of all this has been the utter ruin (and in large part the physical annihilation) of the old Russian middle classes. Many hundreds of thousands, at the very least, must have perished, while those still alive are physically wrecked and spiritually broken. To be sure, there is the so-called "new bourgeoisie," sprung from the ranks of sly food-smugglers and peasant profiteers. But this new bourgeoisie is far inferior to the old in everything except low cunning and crass materialism.

In fact, the Bolsheviks themselves almost deplore the disappearance of the old bourgeoisie when they contemplate its sinister successor. Says *Ivestia*, the Bolshevik official organ: "Our old bourgeoisie has been crushed, and we imagine that there will be no return of old conditions. The power of the Soviets has succeeded the old regime, and the Soviet advocates equality and universal service; but the fruits of this era are not yet ready to harvest, and there are already unbidden guests and new forms of profiteers. They are even now so numerous that we must take measures against them. But the task will be a difficult one, because the new bourgeoisie is more numerous and dangerous than the old. The old bourgeoisie committed many sins, but it did not conceal

them. A bourgeois was a bourgeois. You could recognize him by his appearance. … The old bourgeoisie robbed the people, but it spent part of its money for expensive fixtures and works of art. Its money went by indirect channels to the support of schools, hospitals, and museums. Apparently the old bourgeoisie was ashamed to keep everything for itself; and so gave back part. The new bourgeoisie thinks of nothing but its stomach. Comrades, beware of the new bourgeoisie."

The fate of the middle classes was shared by other elements of Russian society; by the nobility, gentry, capitalists, and "intellectuals." The tragedy of the intellectuals is a peculiarly poignant one. The Russian intellectuals, or Intelligensia, as they called themselves, had for generations been Russia's brain and conscience. In the Intelligentsia were concentrated Russia's best hopes of progress and civilization. The Intelligentsia stood bravely between despotic Czardom and benighted masses, striving to liberalize the one and to enlighten the other, accepting persecution and misunderstanding as part of its noble task. Furthermore, beside the almost caste-like stratification of old Russian society, the Intelligentsia stood, a thing apart. Recruited from all classes, it was not itself a class, but rather a non-class or super-class element. From this it naturally followed that the Intelligentsia was not of one mind. It had its conservatives, its liberals, its radicals, even its violent extremists—from which the brains of Nihilism and Bolshevism were drawn. The prevailing tone was, however, "liberal"; that is to say, a spirit of constructive reform. The Intelligentsia backed the political revolutions of 1905 and March, 1917. The latter, in particular, fired it with boundless hopes. The Intelligentsia believed that its labors and trials were at last to be rewarded; that Russia was to become the liberal, progressive nation of its dreams.

Then came the Bolshevik *coup* of November. The extremist wing of the Intelligentsia accepted Bolshevism with delirium, but the majority rejected it with horror. Bolshevism's narrow class consciousness, savage temper, fierce destructiveness, and hatred of intellect appalled and disgusted the Intelligentsia's liberal idealism. But the Bolsheviks,

on their side, had long hated and despised the intellectuals, regarding them as enemies to be swept ruthlessly from their path. The result was a persecution of the intellectuals as implacable as the persecution of the bourgeoisie. The Russian intellectuals were killed, starved, and driven into exile. Multitudes perished, while the survivors were utterly broken and intellectually sterilized. As time passed, to be sure, the economic collapse of Russia (largely through sheer brain famine) compelled the Bolshevik Government to abate its persecution and to offer some of the intellectuals posts in its service. However, the offer was coupled with such humiliating, slavish conditions that the nobler spirits preferred starvation, while those who accepted did so only in despair.

The martyrdom of the Russian Intelligentsia is vividly described by one of their number in the following poignant lines. Says Leo Pasvolsky: "I have seen educated men coming out of Russia; their general appearance, and particularly the crushed hopelessness of their mental processes, is a nightmare that haunts me every once in a while. They are a living testimonial to the processes that are taking place in Russia. … Such an exodus of the educated and intelligent as there has been out of Russia no country has ever seen, and certainly no country can ever afford. The Intelligentsia has lost everything it had. It has lived to see every ideal it revered shattered, every aim it sought pushed away almost out of sight. Embittered and hardened in exile, or crushed spiritually and physically under the present government, the tragedy of the Russian Intelligentsia is the most pathetic and poignant in human history."

The blows which Bolshevism has dealt Russia's intellectual life have been truly terrible. Indeed, it is not too much to say that Bolsheviam has beheaded Russia. The old Intelligentsia is destroyed, blighted, or in exile. And, so long as Bolshevism rules, it is difficult to see how a new Intelligentsia can arise. The Bolshevik Government has undertaken the herculean task of converting the whole Russian people to Communism, seeing therein the sole guarantee of its continued existence. To this supreme end everything else must be subordinated.

But this means that education, learning, science, art, and every other field of intellectual activity is perverted into propaganda; that all doubtful or hostile ideas must be excluded; that no critical or independent thinking can be tolerated. And history has conclusively demonstrated that where thought is not free there is no true intellectual life, but only intellectual mummies or abortions.

Furthermore, the still more fundamental query arises, whether, even if Bolshevik rule should soon end, Russia may not have suffered such racial losses that the level of her intelligence has been permanently lowered. Russia's biological losses have been appalling. For five long years a systematic extirpation of the upper and middle classes has been going on, and the results of this "inverse selection" are literally staggering. The number of Russian exiles alone, to-day scattered to the four corners of the earth, is estimated at from one to two millions. Add to these the hundreds of thousands who have perished by execution, in prison, in the civil wars, and by disease, cold, and famine; add to these, again, the millions who survive ruined, persecuted, and thus unlikely to rear their normal quota of children; and we begin to realize how the Russian stock has been impaired—how well the Under-Man has done his work!

To be sure, against all this may be set the fact that Russia's racial losses are probably not so terrible as those which Bolshevism would inflict upon the more advanced Western nations. Russia's very backwardness, together with the caste-like rigidity of old Russian society, minimized the action of the "social ladder" and hindered that "draining" of talent from the lower into the higher social classes which has proceeded so rapidly in western Europe and America. Nevertheless, even if Russia's racial losses are not so fatal as those which the West would suffer under similar circumstances, they must be very grave and largely irreparable.

Of course these considerations can have no influence whatever upon the conduct of the Bolsheviks themselves, because the philosophy of the Under-Man denies heredity, believes passionately in "natural equality" and the omnipotence of environment, and pins its faith on

mass quantity instead of individual quality.

Indeed, the Bolsheviks believe that the whole world order, both as it now exists and as it has in the past existed, is hopelessly aristocratic or bourgeois; that to the proletariat it is meaningless and useless; that it should therefore be utterly destroyed; and that in its place must arise a new "proletarian" world order, created exclusively by and for the proletariat. This theory is absolute. It makes no exceptions; all fields of human activity, even science, art, and literature, being included. The climax of this theory is the Bolshevik doctrine of "Proletarian Culture," or, as it is termed in Bolshevik circles, Prolet-kult.

Of course, here as elsewhere, Bolshevism has invented nothing really new. The idea of "proletarian culture" was preached by the Syndicalists twenty years ago. The Bolsheviks have, however, elaborated the doctrine, and in Russia they are actually attempting to practise it. The Russian Bolsheviks are, to be sure, divided over the immediate cultural policy to be pursued. Some assert that, since existing culture is to the proletariat meaningless, useless, and even dangerous, it should be scrapped forthwith. Others maintain that existing culture contains certain educative elements, and that these should therefore be used for the stimulation of the proletarian culture of the future. To the latter faction (which has the support of Lenin) is due the preservation of Russia's art treasures and the maintenance of certain artistic activities like the theatre and the opera along more or less traditional lines. However, these factional differences, as already stated, are merely differences of policy. In principle both factions are agreed, their common goal being the creation of an exclusive, proletarian culture. Let us, therefore, examine this doctrine of Prolet-kult as expounded by its partisans in Russia and elsewhere.

The arch-champion of Prolet-kult in Russia is Lunacharsky. He is one of the most powerful Bolshevik leaders and holds the post of Commissar of Education in the Soviet Government, so he is well able to make his cultural ideas felt. Lunacharaky holds the doctrine of Prolet-kult in its most uncompromising form. His official organ, *Proletarskaia Kultura*

(Proletarian Culture) sets forth authoritatively the Bolshevik cultural view. Let us see precisely what it is.

Lunacharsky categorically condemns existing "bourgeois" culture from top to bottom, and asserts that it must be destroyed and replaced by a wholly new proletarian culture. Says Lunacharsky "Our enemies, during the whole course of the revolutionary period, have not ceased crying about the ruin of culture. As if they did not know that in Russia, as well as everywhere, there is no united common human culture, but that there is only a *bourgeois* culture, an individual culture, debasing itself into a culture of Imperialism—covetous, bloodthirsty, ferocious. The revolutionary proletariat aspires to free itself from the path of a dying culture. It is working out its own class, proletarian culture. … During its dictatorship, the proletariat has realized that the strength of its revolution consists not alone in a political and military dictatorship, but also in a cultural dictatorship."

Lunacharsky's editorial dictum is enthusiastically indorsed by multitudes of "Comrades" who, in prose and verse, enliven *Proletarskaia Kultura's* edifying pages. The old bourgeois culture is, of course, the object of fierce hatred. Sings one poetic soul:

> "In the name of our To-morrow we will burn Rafael,
> Destroy museums, crush the flowers of art.
> Maidens in the radiant kingdom of the Future
> Will be more beautiful than Venus de Milo."

Science (as it now exists) is likewise under the ban. For example, one "Comrade" Bogdanoff, desiring to show what transformations the material sciences and philosophy will have to undergo in order to make them suitable for proletarian understanding, enunciates a series of propositions. Of these the ninth is that astronomy must be transformed from its present state into a "teaching of the orientation in space and time of the efforts of labor."

To the non-Bolshevik mind these ideas sound insane. But they are not insane. They are merely a logical recognition of the fact that, in a society organized exclusively on proletarian principles, every thread in

the fabric, whether it be political, social, economic, or artistic, must harmonize with the whole design, and must be inspired by one and the same idea—class consciousness and collectivism. This is clearly perceived by some contributors. Says one: "In order to be a proletarian creator it is not enough to be an artist; it is also necessary to know economics, the laws of their development, and to have a complete knowledge of the Marxist method, which makes it possible to expose all the strata and mouldiness of the bourgeois fabric." And another observes: "Marx has established that society is, above all, an organization of production, and that in this lies the basis of all the laws of its life, all development of its forms. This is the point of view of the social-productive class; the point of view of the working collective."

Indeed, one writer goes so far as to question the need for any art at all in the future proletarian culture. According to this Comrade, art arose out of individual striving, passion, sorrow, disillusion, the conflict of the individual with the Fates (whatever shapes they might take, whether those of gods, God, or Capitalists). In the Communistic society of the future, where everybody will be satisfied and happy, these artistic stimuli will no longer exist, and art will thus become both unnecessary and impossible.

This annihilating suggestion is, however, exceptional; the other Comrades assume that proletarian culture will have its artistic side. Proletarian art must, however, be mass art; the concepts of genius and individual creation are severely reprobated. This is, of course, in accordance with the general theory of Bolshevism: that the individual must be merged in the collectivity; that talented individuals merely express the will of the mass incarnated in them. This Bolshevik war against individuality explains why the overwhelming majority of the Russian Intelligentsia is so irreconcilably opposed to Bolshevism. It also explains why those who have bowed to Bolshevism have ceased to produce good work. They have been intellectually emasculated.

The Comrades of *Proletarskaia Kultura* set forth logically why proletarian culture must be exclusively the work of proletarians. This

is because only a proletarian, strong in his class consciousness, can think or feel as a proletarian. Therefore, only to true proletarians is given the possibility of creating proletarian culture. Converts of bourgeois origin may think themselves proletarians, but they can never really belong to the creative elect. To this stern rule there are no exceptions. Even Karl Marx is excluded from along the proletarian's "deeper experiences"; like Moses, he may "look into the land of milk and honey, but never enter it."

Furthermore, this new culture, produced exclusively by proletarians, must be produced in strictly proletarian fashion. The "culture workman," reduced to a cog in the creative machinery, produces cultural commodities like any other commodities, turns out art and literature precisely like boots and clothing. Why not, since culture, like industry, is subject to unbending economic principles and can be expressed in a collective convention symbolized by the machine? Why should not an artist or author be like an ordinary workman, working so many hours a day in the company of other artistic or literary workmen, and pooling their labors to produce a joint and anonymous product?

The upshot of all this is the artists' or writers' workshop. Here we have the fine flower of proletarian culture! Bourgeois methods are, it seems, all wrong. They are intolerably antisocial. The bourgeois author or artist is an incorrigible individualist. He works on inspiration and in the solitude of his study or studio. For proletarian authors and artists such methods are unthinkable. Neither inspiration nor individual absorption being necessary to them, they will gather at a fixed hour for their communal labors in their workshops. Let us look in on a writers' workshop as depicted by Comrade Kerzhentsev:

> "The literary work of the studios may be divided into various branches. First, the selection of the subject. Many authors have special ability in finding favorable subjects, while utterly unable to develop them respectably. Let them give their subjects to others. Let these subjects, and perhaps separate parts of them—scenes, pictures, episodes, various types and situations—be collected. From this treasure of thought, material will be

extracted by others. … It is precisely in such studios that a collective composition may be written. Perhaps various chapters will be written by various people. Perhaps various types and situations will be worked out and embodied by various authors. The whole composition may be finally written by a single person, but with the constant and systematic collaboration of the other members of the studio in the particular work."

This appalling nonsense is wittily punctured by an English critic in the following pungent lines:

> "What self-respecting author will submit to the bondage of the this human machine, this 'factory of literature'? This scheme, to my mind, is too preposterous to require an answer; yet, if one must be given, it can be contained in a single word: Shakespeare!
>
> Here was an individual who could write a better lyric, better prose, could define the passions better, could draw clearer types, had a better knowledge of human psychology, could construct better, was superior in every department of the literary art to all his contemporaries. A whole 'studio' of Elizabethans, great as each was individually, could have hardly put together a work of art as 'collective' (if you will) and as perfect as this one man by himself. Imagine the harmony of Homer bettered by a collection of 'gas-bags' meeting to discuss his work! Imagine the colossal comedy of an Aristophanes 'improved' by the assistance of a lot of solemn-faced *sans-culottes*, dominated by an *idee fixe*, whom the comic author might even wish to satirize!
>
> Would even lesser men consent to it? Imagine Wells and Bennett and Conrad and Chesterton, with their individual minds, produced in the opulent diversity of nature, collaborating in one room. Picture to yourself, if you can, a literary workshop, shared by Cannan, Lawrence, Beresford, Mackenzie, assisted, say, by Mrs. Humpfry Ward, Marie Corelli, and Elinor Glyn.
>
> To this, the Bolsheviks will of course give their stereotyped reply that this diverse condition has been brought about by a bourgeois

> civilization; for laws of nature, the stumbling-block of good and bad Utopias, do not exist for them. But it is a long way from theory to practice, and they are a long way from having bound the Prometheus of creation to the Marxian rock."

The Russian Bolsheviks have, however, tried to do so in at least one notable instance. We have all heard of the famous (or notorious) "House of Science," where Russia's surviving savants have been barracked under one roof and told to get together and produce. Thus far, the House of Science has produced nothing but a high death-rate.

So much for Prolet-kult in Russia. Perhaps it may be thought that this is a special Russian aberration. This, however, is not the case. Prolet-kult is indorsed by Bolsheviks everywhere. For example: those stanch "Comrades," Eden and Cedar Paul, twin pillars of British Bolshevism and acknowledged as heralds of the Communist cause by Bolshevik circles in both England and America, have devoted their latest book to this very subject. In this book all "bourgeois culture" is scathingly condemned. Our so-called "general culture" is "a purely class heritage." "There is no culture for the 'common people,' for the hewers of wood and the drawers of water." There is no such thing as "scientific" economics or sociology. For these reasons, say the authors, there should be organized and spread abroad a new kind of education, "Proletcult." This, we are informed, "is a fighting culture, aiming at the overthrow of capitalism and at the replacement of democratic culture and bourgeois ideology by ergatocratic culture and proletarian ideology." The authors warmly indorse the Soviet Government's prostitution of education and all other forms of intellectual activity to Communist propaganda, for we are told that the "new education" is inspired by "the new psychology," which "provides the philosophical justification of Bolshevism and supplies a theoretical guide for our efforts in the field of proletarian culture. … Education is suggestion. The recognition that suggestion is autosuggestion, and that autosuggestion is the means whereby imagination controls the subconscious self, will enable us to make a right use of the most potent force which has become available to the members of the

human herd since the invention of articulate speech. The function of the Proletculturist is to fire the imagination, until the imagination realizes itself in action." This is the revolution's best hope, for "the industrial workers cannot have their minds clarified by an education which has not freed itself from all taint of bourgeois ideology."

Such is the philosophy of the Under-Man, preached by Bolsheviks throughout the world. And in practice, as in theory, Bolshevism has everywhere proved strikingly the same. As already stated, the triumph of Bolshevism in Russia started a wave of militant unrest which has invaded the remotest corners of the earth. No part of the world has been free from Bolshevik plots and Bolshevik propaganda, directed from Moscow.

Furthermore, this Bolshevik propaganda has been extraordinarily clever in adapting means to ends. No possible source of discontent bas been overlooked. Strictly "Red" doctrines like the dictatorship of the proletariat are very far from being the only weapons in Bolshevism's armory. Since what is first wanted is the overthrow of the existing world order, any kind of opposition to that order, no matter how remote doctrinally from Bolshevism, is grist to the Bolshevist mill. Accordingly, in every quarter of the globe, in Asia, Africa, Australia, and the Americas, as in Europe, Bolshevik agitators have whispered in the ears of the discontented their gospel of hatred and revenge. Every nationalist aspiration, every political grievance, every social injustice, every racial discrimination, is fuel for Bolshevism's incitement to violence and war.

To describe Bolshevism's subversive efforts throughout the world would fill a book in itself. Let us confine our attention to the two most striking fields of Bolshevist activity outside of Russia—Hungary and Asia.

The Bolshevik regime in Hungary represents the crest of the revolutionary wave which swept over Central Europe during the year 1919. It was short-lived, lasting less than six months, but during that brief period it almost ruined Hungary. As in Russia, the Bolshevik coup

in Hungary was effected by a small group of revolutionary agitators, taking advantage of a moment of acute political disorganization, and backed by the most violent elements of the city proletariat. The leaders were mainly young "intellectuals," ambitious but not previously successful in life, and were mostly Jews. The guiding spirit was one Bela Kun, a man of fiery energy but of rather unedifying antecedents. Kun had evidently come to disapprove of the institution of private property at an early age, for he had been expelled from school for theft, and later on, during a term in jail, he was caught stealing from a fellow prisoner. Down to 1914 Kun's career was that of a radical agitator. Early in the war he was captured by the Russians, and after the Russian revolution he joined the Bolsheviki. Picked by Lenin as a valuable agent, he was sent home at the end of the war with instructions to Bolshevize Hungary. His first efforts led to his arrest by the Hungarian authorities, but he soon got free and engineered the coup which placed him and his associates in power.

The new revolutionary government started in on approved Bolshevik lines. Declaring a "dictatorship of the proletariat," it established an iron despotism enforced by "Red Guards," prohibited liberty of speech or the press and confiscated private property. Fortunately there was comparatively little bloodshed. This was due to the express orders of Lenin, who, realizing how exposed was the position of Bolshevik Hungary, told Bela Kun to go slow and consolidate his position before taking more drastic measures. Kun, however, found it hard to control the zeal of his associates. Many of these were burning with hatred of the bourgeoisie and were anxious to "complete the revolution."

In the last days of the Bolshevik regime, when its fall appeared more and more probable, the more violent elements got increasingly out of hand. Incendiary speeches were made inciting the proletariat to plunder and slaughter the bourgeois classes. For example, Pogany, one of the Bolshevik leaders, launched the following diatribe at the middle classes: "Tremble before our revenge! We shall exterminate you, not only as a class but literally to the last man among you. We look upon you as hostages, and the coming of Allied troops shall be of ill omen

for you. Nor need you rejoice in the white flag of the coming bourgeois armies, for your own blood shall dye it red."

As a matter of fact, many atrocities took place, especially those committed by a bloodthirsty Commissar named Szamuely and a troop of ruffians known as the "Lenin Boys." However, there was no general massacre. The Bolsheviks were restrained by the sobering knowledge that they were surrounded by "white" armies, and that a massacre of Budapest bourgeois would mean their own wholesale extirpation. At the very last, most of the leaders escaped to Austria and thence ultimately succeeded in making their way to Moscow.

So ended the Hungarian Soviet Republic. Despite the relatively small loss of life, the material damage done was enormous. The whole economic life of the country was disrupted, huge debts were contracted, and Hungary was left a financial wreck.

As matters turned out, Soviet Hungary was merely an episode—albeit an instructive episode, since it shows how near Europe was to Bolshevism in 1919. Quite otherwise is it with Asia. Here the Bolshevik onset is very far from having failed. On the contrary, it has gained important successes, and must be seriously reckoned with in the immediate future.

Asia to-day is full of explosive possibilities. For the past half century the entire Orient has been the scene of a vast, complicated ferment, due largely to the impact of Western ideas, which has produced an increasing unrest—political, economic, social, religious, and much more besides. Oriental unrest was, of course, enormously aggravated by the Great War. In many parts of the Near East, especially, acute suffering, balked ambitions, and furious hates combined to reduce society to the verge of chaos.

Into this ominous turmoil there now came the sinister influence of Russian Bolshevism, marshalling all this diffused unrest by systematic efforts for definite ends. Asia was, in fact, Bolshevism's "second string." Bolshevism was frankly out for a world revolution and the destruction of Western Civilization. It had vowed the

"proletarianizatiom" of the whole world, beginning with the Western peoples but ultimately including all peoples. To attain this objective the Bolshevik leaders not only launched direct assaults on the West, but also planned flank attacks in Asia. They believed that, if the East could be set on fire, not only would Russian Bolshevism gain vast additional strength, but also the economic repercussion on the West, already shaken by the war, would be so terrific that industrial collapse would ensue, thereby throwing Europe open to revolution.

In its Oriental policy, Russian Bolshevism was greatly aided by the political legacy of Russian imperialism. From Turkey to China, Asia had long been the scene of Russian imperialist designs and had been carefully studied by Russian agents who had evolved a technique of "pacific penetration" that might be easily adjusted to Bolshevik ends. To intrigue in the Orient required no original planning by Trotzky or Lenin. Czarism had already done this for generations, and full information lay both in the Petrograd archives and in the brains of surviving Czarist agents, ready to turn their hands as easily to the new work as the old.

In all the elaborate network of Bolshevik propaganda which to-day enmeshes the East, we must discriminate between Bolshevism's two objectives: one immediate—the destruction of Western political and economic power; the other ultimate—the Bolshevizing of the Oriental masses and the consequent extirpation of the native upper and middle classes, precisely as has been done in Russia and as is planned for the countries of the West. In the first stage, Bolshevism is quite ready to back Oriental "nationalist" movements and to respect Oriental faiths and customs. In the second stage all these matters are to be branded as "bourgeois" and relentlessly destroyed.

Russian Bolshevism's Oriental policy was formulated soon after its accession to power at the close of 1917. The year 1918 was a time of busy preparation. An elaborate propaganda organization was built up from various sources: from old Czarist agents; from the Russian Mohammedan populations such as the Tartars of South Russia and the Turkomans of Central Asia; and from the nationalist or radical exiles

who flocked to Russia from Turkey, Persia, India, China, Korea, and even Japan. By the end of 1918, Bolshevism's Oriental propaganda department was well organized, divided into three bureaus, for the Islamic countries, India, and the Far East respectively. These bureaus displayed great activity, translating tons of Bolshevik literature into the various Oriental languages, training numerous secret agents and propagandists for "field-work," and getting in touch with disaffected or revolutionary elements.

The effects of Bolshevik propaganda have been visible in nearly all the disturbances which have afflicted the Orient since 1918. In China and Japan few tangible successes have as yet been won, albeit the symptoms of increasing social unrest in both those countries have aroused distinct uneasiness among well-informed observers. In the Near and Middle East, however, Bolshevism has achieved much more definite results. Indian unrest has been stimulated by Bolshevik propaganda; Afghanistan, Turkey, and Persia have all been drawn more or less into Soviet Russia's political orbit; while Central Asia and the Caucasus regions have been definitely Bolshevized and turned into "Soviet Republics" dependent upon Moscow. Thus Bolshevism is to-day in actual operation in both the Near and Middle East.

Soviet Russia's Oriental aims were frankly announced at the "Congress of Eastern Peoples" held at Baku, Trans-Caucasia, in the autumn of 1920. The president of the congress, the noted Russian Bolshevik leader, Zinoviev, stated in his opening address:

> "We believe this Congress to be one of the greatest events in history, for it proves not only that the progressive workers and working peasants of Europe and America are awakened, but that we have at last seen the day of the awakening, not of a few, but of tens of thousands, of hundreds of thousands, of millions of the laboring class of the peoples of the East. These peoples form the majority of the world's whole population, and they alone, therefore, are able to bring the war between capital and labor to a conclusive decision.

> The Communist International said from the very first day of its existence: 'There are four or five times as many people living in Asia as live in Europe. We will free all peoples, all who labor.' … We know that the laboring masses of the East are in part retrograde. Comrades, our Moscow International discussed the question whether a socialist revolution could take place in the countries of the East before those countries had passed through the capitalist stage. You know that the view which long prevailed was that every country must first go through the period of capitalism before socialism could become a live question. We now believe that this is no longer true. Russia has done this, and from that moment we are able to say that China, India, Turkey, Persia, Armenia also can, and must, make a direct fight to get the Soviet system. These countries can, and must, prepare themselves to be Soviet republics.
>
> We array ourselves against the English bourgeoisie; we seize the English imperialist by the throat and tread him under foot. It is against English capitalism that the worst, the most fatal blow must be dealt. That is so. But at the same time we must educate the laboring masses of the East to hatred, to the will to fight the whole of the rich classes indifferently, whoever they may be … so that the world may be ruled by the worker's horny hand."

Such is Russian Bolshevism's Asiatic goal. And it is a goal by no means impossible of attainment. Of course, the numbers of class-conscious "proletarians" in the East are very small, while the Communist philosophy is virtually unintelligible to the Oriental masses. These facts have often been adduced to prove that Bolshevism can never upset Asia. The best answer to such arguments is—Soviet Russia! In Russia an infinitesimal Communist minority, numbering, by its own admission, not much over 600,000, is maintaining an unlimited despotism over at least 150,000,000 people. And the Orient is, politically and socially, much like Russia. Western countries may rely upon their stanch traditions of ordered liberty and their highly developed social systems; the East possesses no such bulwarks against

Bolshevism. In the Orient, as in Russia, there is the same backwardness of the masses, the same absence of a large and powerful middle class, the same tradition of despotism, the same popular acquiescence in the rule of ruthless minorities. Finally, the East is filled with every sort of unrest.

The Orient is thus patently menaced with Bolshevism. And any extensive spread of Bolshevism in the East would be a hideous catastrophe both for the Orient and for the world at large. For the East, Bolshevism would spell downright savagery. The sudden release of the ignorant, brutal Oriental masses from their traditional restraints of religion and custom, and the submergence of the relatively small upper and middle classes by the flood of social revolution, would mean the destruction of all Oriental civilization and a plunge into an abyss of anarchy from which the East might not emerge for centuries.

For the world as a whole the prospect would be perhaps even more terrible. The welding of Russia and the Orient into a vast revolutionary block would spell a gigantic war between East and West beside which the late war would seem mere child's play and which might leave the entire planet a mass of ruins.

Yet this is precisely what the Soviet leaders are working for, and what they frankly—even gleefully—prophesy. The vision of a revolutionary East destroying the "bourgeois" West fills many Bolshevists with wild exultation. Says the Bolshevist poet Peter Oryeschin: "Holy Mother Earth is shaken by the tread of millions of marching feet. The crescent has left the mosque; the crucifix the church. The end of Paris impends, for the East has lifted its sword. I saw tawny Chinamen leering through the windows of the Urals. India washes its garments as for a festival. From the steppes rises the smoke of sacrifice to the new god. London shall sink beneath the waves. Gray Berlin shall lie in ruins. Sweet will be the pain of the noblest who fall in battle. Down from Mont Blanc hordes will sweep through God's golden valleys. Even the Kirghiz of the steppes will pray for the new era."

Thus, in the East as in the West, the world, wearied and shaken by the

late war, is faced by a new war—the war against chaos.

CHAPTER VII—THE WAR AGAINST CHAOS

THE world is to-day the battleground of a titanic struggle. This struggle has long been gathering. It is now upon us and must be fought out. No land is immune. Bolshevik Russia is merely the standard-bearer of a revolt against civilization which girdles the globe. That revolt was precipitated by the late war and has been intensified by war's aftermath, but it was latent before 1914 and would have ultimately burst forth even if Armageddon had been averted.

In the present revolt against civilization there is nothing basically new. Viewed historically, it is merely one of a series of similar destructive, retrograde movements. What is new, however, is the elaboration of a revolutionary philosophy which has fired and welded the rebellious elements as never before. As Le Bon justly remarks: "The Bolshevik mentality is as old as history. Cain, in the Old Testament, had the mind of a Bolshevik. But it is only in our days that this ancient mentality has met with a political doctrine to justify it. This is the reason of its rapid propagation, which has been undermining the old social scaffolding."

The modern philosophy of the Under-Man is at bottom a mere "rationalizing" of the emotions of the unadaptable, inferior, and degenerate elements, rebellious against the civilization which irks them and longing to revert to more primitive levels. We have already seen how the revolutionary spirit assails every phase of our civilization, the climax being the Bolshevik attempt to substitute a "proletarian" culture." Most significant of all are the attacks launched upon science, particularly the science of biology. Revolutionists are coming to realize that science, with its stern love of truth, is their most dangerous enemy, and that the discoveries of biology are relentlessly exposing their cleverest sophistries. Accordingly, the champions of the Under-Man, extremists and "moderates" alike, cling desperately to the exploded doctrines of environmentalism and "natural equality," and dub modern biology mere class snobbery or capitalist propaganda.

In fact, attempts have been made to invent a "new" biology, more in

accordance with proletarian maxims. For example, some Socialist writers have evolved the theory that social and intellectual evolution is the cause of physical evolution; in other words, that it is his customs and tools which have made man, and not man his tools and customs. Other writers have gone even farther and maintain that "cell intelligence" (which they assume to be present in all protoplasm) is the cause of all forms of evolution. The logical conclusion of this amazing hypothesis should apparently be that intelligence is not confined to the brain but is diffused over the whole body. Here is good proletarian biology, quite in accord with the Bolshevik doctrine that so-called "superior" individuals are merely expressions of the mass intelligence. It is surprising that, so far as can be learned, the theory of cell intelligence is not yet taught in the Soviet schools. This is a serious omission—but it can be remedied.

Naturally, these grotesque perversions of science, with their resultant paradoxes worthy of Mr. Chesterton, are easily disposed of by genuine biologists and the underlying animus is clearly explained. Regarding proletarian biology, Professor Conklin remarks: "Such a conception not only confuses the different lines of evolution and their causes, but it really denies all the facts and evidences in the case by putting the highest and latest product of the process into its earliest and most elemental stages. It is not a theory of evolution but rather one of involution or creation; it is not now a new conception of life and its origin but the oldest known conception… Such essays evidently owe their origin to emotion rather than to reason, to sentiment rather than science; they are based upon desire rather than evidence, and they appeal especially to those who are able to believe what they desire to believe."

Proletarian "science" having shown no signs of ability to meet real science in intellectual combat, we may expect to see the proletarian movement fall back upon its natural weapons—passion and violence. What seems certain is that science will become increasingly anathema in social revolutionary eyes. The lists are in fact already set for a battle royal between biology and Bolshevism. We have already

remarked that the more the Under-Man realizes the significance of the new biological revelation, the uglier grows his mood. Science having stripped away its sentimental camouflage, the social revolution will depend more and more upon brute force, relying upon the materialism of numbers and racial impoverishment to achieve final victory. More and more the revolutionary watchword will be that of the French Communist, Henri Barbusse "Le Couteau entre les Dents!"—"With Your Knife in Your Teeth!"

How shall civilization meet the revolutionary onset? By a combination of two methods: one palliative and temporary; the other constructive and permanent. Discussion of the second method will be deferred till the next chapter. Suffice it here to say that it centres about certain deep-going reforms, particularly the improvement of the race itself. Forward-looking minds are coming to realize that social revolutions are really social *breakdowns,* caused (in the last analysis) by a dual process of racial impoverishment—the elimination of superior strains and the multiplication of degenerates and inferiors. Inexorably the decay of racial values corrodes the proudest civilization, which engenders within itself those forces of chaos that will one day work its ruin. Said shrewd old Rivarol, viewing the French Revolution: "The most civilized empires are as close to barbarism as the most polished steel is to rust; nations, like metals, shine only on the surface."

More and more we are coming to see that hatred of civilization is mainly a matter of heredity; that Bolsheviks are mostly born and not made. How can we expect a man to support a social order which he instinctively detests or which he is congenitally unable to achieve? And how can society expect peaceful progress so long as it spawns social rebels and laggards, and at the same time sterilizes those creative superiors who are at once its builders and preservers?

The fact is that construction and destruction, progress and regress, evolution and revolution, are alike the work of *dynamic minorities.* We have already seen how numerically small are the talented elites which create and advance civilizations; while Jacobin France and Bolshevik Russia prove how a small but ruthless revolutionary faction can wreck

a social order and tyrannize over a great population. Of course, these dynamic groups are composed primarily of leaders—they are the officer's corps of much larger armies which mobilize instinctively when crises arise. Take the present world crisis. In every country the champions of the existing order can count upon the resolute support of all those who appreciate our civilization and wish to preserve it from disruption. On the other hand, the revolutionary leaders can count with equal confidence upon the unadaptable, inferior, and degenerate elements, who naturally dislike our civilization and welcome a summons to its overthrow.

Such are the distinctively "superior" and "inferior" groups—the standing armies of civilization and of chaos. But, even when fully mobilized, these armies are minorities. Between them stands an intermediate mass of mediocrity, which, even in the most civilized countries, probably constitutes a majority of the whole people. In the United States, for example, this intermediate mass is typified by the various "C" grades of the Army Intelligence Tests—the men with mental ages of from twelve to fifteen years, whom the tests indicated comprised 61½ per cent of the total population. These people are incapable of either creating or maintaining a high civilization. For that they are dependent upon the superiors; just as in the army they depend upon the "A" and "B" grades of the officer's corps, without whom they would be as sheep without a shepherd. However, these mediocres are not "inferiors" in the technical sense; they are capable of adapting themselves to the ordinary requirements of civilization, and of profiting by the superior's creative achievements—profiting often so successfully that they attain great wealth and influence.

In some respects the mediocre have their social value. Their very lack of initiative renders them natural conservers of whatever they adopt, and they thus act as social ballast and as a brake to prevent the elite from going too fast and getting out of touch with reality. They also usually support the existing social order, and thus tend to oppose revolution.

However, the mediocre have the defects of their qualities. Their very

conservatism is apt to be harmful, and is frequently disastrous. This is because it is unintelligent—a mere clinging to things as they are, with no discrimination between what is sound and what is unsound or outworn; a mere blind aversion to change just because it is change. This is sheer *bourbonism*. And bourbonism is dangerous because it blocks progress, prevents reform, perpetuates social evils, breeds discontent, and thus engenders revolution.

The chief danger of bourbonism is that it is so powerful. If society were really guided by its creative elite, mediocrity might be useful as a sort of "constitutional opposition" stabilizing and regulating progress. Unfortunately, society is ruled largely by mediocrity. The most cursory survey of our world is enough to show that in politics, finance, business, and most other fields of human activity, a large proportion of the most influential figures are persons of decidedly mediocre intelligence and character. The number of stupid reactionaries in high places is depressing, and their stupidity is amazing when we consider their opportunities. In fact, these opportunities are the best proof of their inherent stupidity, because the mere fact that so little has been brought out shows that there was very little there to bring.

At first sight all this may seem to conflict with what we have previously discovered: that superiors tend to rise in the social scale, and that in advanced modern societies there has been a marked concentration of superiority in the middle and upper classes. But when we look more closely, we see that there is no real discrepancy. In the first place, the concentration of ability in the upper social strata is not absolute, but relative. Relatively, the upper and middle classes of society undoubtedly contain a higher percentage of superiority than do the lower classes. But this most emphatically does not mean that the upper and middle classes are made up wholly of superior persons while the lower social strata are composed wholly of inferiors. On the contrary, the lower social strata unquestionably contain multitudes of valuable strains which have not yet displayed themselves by rising in the social scale. This is particularly true where the "social ladder" and

assortative mating have not drained the lower classes and sharply stratified the population. For example, in the American Army Intelligence Tests some of the best scores were made by illiterate, ignorant Southern mountaineers who had never before been outside their native valleys. In other words, primitive conditions had held back a high-grade Anglo-Saxon stock; but the intelligence was there, passed on from generation to generation, and only waiting a favorable opportunity to display itself.

We thus see that superior intelligence is not a monopoly of the upper and middle social classes, albeit they do possess a distinct relative advantage in this respect.

The next question which naturally arises is: What are the proportions of superiors to mediocres and inferiors within these classes? The question of inferiority need not long detain us. The demands of modern life are sufficiently great, and the social ladder works sufficiently well to weed out most of the distinctly inferior individuals who arise in the upper and middle strata of society by socially sterilizing them as economic failures or by forcing them down to lower social levels.

With mediocrity, however, it is quite otherwise. A glance at social statistics is enough to prove that a large proportion of both the upper and middle classes must consist of mediocrities. Consider the relative size of social groups. In most Western nations from 5 to 10 per cent of the population should certainly be counted as belonging to the upper social classes, while the middle classes (urban and rural) probably run between 20 and 40 per cent. Now, compare these figures with the matter of intelligence. We have already seen that biological, sociological, and psychological researches have alike revealed the fact that high intelligence is rare. The American Army Intelligence Tests indicate that only 4½ per cent of the American population are of “very superior intelligence” (Grade “A”), while only 9 per cent are of “superior intelligence” (Grade “B”). We have also seen that superior intelligence is by no means exclusively confined to the upper and middle social strata. Yet, even if superior intelligence were so

confined, we have every reason to believe that these strata would still consist largely of mediocrities, for the very simple reason that there would not be enough genuine superiors to go around.

This raises a third question: Within the upper social strata, what is the relative status of superiors and mediocres, measured by recognized standards of achievement and by a direct influence in the community? This is a matter of great importance. If high intelligence be so rare, it is vital to social progress, and even to social security, that it should function with the greatest possible efficiency and should exert the greatest possible effect. Now, no unbiased student of modern life can doubt that this is very far from being the case. The melancholy truth is that our stock of high creative intelligence (all to meagre at best) is in the main imperfectly utilized. To be sure, those pessimists who assert that it is nearly all wasted are wrong. In advanced modern societies the genuine superior can usually rise, and in many fields, like science, art, literature, and certain of the professions, he may reasonably hope to rise to the very top.

In other fields, however, particularly in politics, finance, and business, this is not the case. Here, too, creative intelligence does tend to rise, and sometimes rises to the top. But more frequently the highest posts are filled by essentially mediocre personalities—shrewd, aggressive, acquisitive, yet lacking that constructive vision which is the birthmark of true greatness.

Now, this is a serious matter, because it is precisely these fields wherein constructive leadership is supremely important for social progress and social stability. History proves conclusively that revolutions are precipitated mainly by inefficient government and unwise finance. Here more than anywhere else the guidance of superior intelligence is a vital necessity. Were our political and economic life to-day guided by our best minds, we should have little to fear from social revolution. A series of constructive reforms would safeguard the future, while the present revolutionary onslaught would be summarily repelled. High intelligence is nearly always well poised, and can be depended upon in a crisis to keep cool and do the right

thing. Mediocrity, on the other hand, lacks poise and vision. Yet governments are to-day everywhere mainly in mediocre hands. Governments should govern; should have faith in themselves and the principles they stand for; and should meet the challenge of aggressive minorities with intelligent foresight, instant action, and unflinching courage. The mere fact that the revolutionists are a minority is no safeguard, because it is determined minorities, not passive majorities, that get their way. The lesson of past revolutions, particularly the Russian Bolshevik Revolution, is that a small but resolute faction possesses the same decisive tactical advantage as a small but highly disciplined and enthusiastic army attacking a huge but ill-organized and spiritless foe. In such cases the assailants have the inestimable advantage of knowing what they want and exactly where they mean to make their attack. The defenders, on the contrary, not only do not know their own minds, but also usually fail to see precisely where, when and how the attack is coming. They stand, fearful and irresolute, waiting to be hit—beaten before they are struck.

To avert this danger we need *intelligent* action. For one thing, public opinion should be carefully informed about the basic issues involved. When people appreciate the true nature of social revolution, the irreparable cultural and racial losses, the terrible setback to progress, they will realize that all sections of the population except the inferior and degenerate elements would be the losers, and they will resolve determinedly to preserve civilization from disruption.

By "information," however, I most emphatically do not mean "propaganda." The truth about social revolution is enough to open the eyes of all who believe in orderly progress; while neither argument nor entreaty can convert those temperamentally predisposed to violent subversive action. We must clearly recognize that there exists an irreconcilable minority of congenital revolutionists—born rebels against civilization, who can be restrained only by superior force. This rebel minority has, however, evolved a philosophy peculiarly enticing in these troubled transition times when discontent is rife, old beliefs shattered, and the new goals not yet plainly in sight. Under these

circumstances the philosophy of revolt has attracted multitudes of persons impatient of present ills and grasping at the hope of violent short cuts to progress. This is particularly true of certain types of emotional liberals, who play in with the revolutionists—and are used as catspaws. Here we have the chief reasons for that idealization of revolution which has such a vogue in many quarters. However, these unwitting dupes are not at heart irreconcilable enemies of society. They simply do not realize that they are on a path which leads to chaos. If they came to realize social revolution's inevitable consequences, most of them would stop aiding the revolutionists in their attacks on society, and would join forces with those who are striving for constructive progress by evolutionary methods. The real revolutionists would thus be deprived of much of their present strength, and could be more easily dealt with.

Now, this may be accomplished by instructive information. It cannot be accomplished by "propaganda." Hysterical denunciations of Bolshevism, specializing in atrocity stories and yarns like the "nationalization of women," defeat their own object. They divert attention from fundamentals to details, generate heat without light, spread panic rather than resolution, and invite blind reaction instead of discriminating action. Such propaganda stirs up a multitude of silly people who run around looking for Communists under the bed and calling everybody a "Bolshevik" who happens to disagree with them. This modern witch-finding is not only fatuous; it is harmful as well. Many of those denounced as "Bolsheviks" are not genuine social rebels at all, but people so harassed by social ills or personal misfortunes that they blindly take Bolshevism's false promises at their face value. These people need education, not persecution. To dragoon and insult them simply drives them into the Bolshevik's arms. The thing to do is to understand exactly who the real Bolsheviks are, attend to them thoroughly, and then give suspects the benefit of the doubt.

The real social rebels should, of course, be given short shrift. No misguided sentimentality should shield those who plot the disruption of civilization and the degradation of the race. Boasting, as they do,

that they have declared war upon the social order, let them be taken at their word. These irreconcilables should be carefully watched, strictly punished when they offend, and where anything like revolution is attempted—hunted down and extirpated. They who take the sword against society must perish by society's sword.

Yet we should not forget that repression, of itself, solves nothing. Knowing, as we do, that Bolsheviks are mostly born and not made, we must realize that new social rebels will arise until their recruiting grounds are eliminated. When society takes in hand the betterment of the race, when degenerates and inferiors are no longer permitted to breed like lice, the floods of chaos will soon dry up.

Until then repression must go on. But we must know exactly what we are about. Repression is a dangerous weapon, which should be used only within strictly defined limits—and even then with regret.

Now, what are the limits of repression? They are the limits of *action*. Revolutionary action should be instantly, inexorably repressed. There the dead-line should be drawn, so clear and plain that all would know what trespass means. But beyond that forbidden zone—*freedom!* No tampering with freedom of thought under any circumstances, and no curtailment of free speech except where it incites to violence and thus practically crosses the dead-line.

Society should say to its discontented: "You may think what you please. You may discuss what you please. You may advocate what you please, *except it involve violence, express or implied.* If you preach or insinuate violence, you will be punished. If you throw bombs, you will be individually executed. If you try revolutions, you will be collectively wiped out. But so long as you avoid doing these forbidden things, you may be watched, but you will not be interfered with."

At this point the timid or stupid reactionary may exclaim: "But this is giving Bolshevism a chance to hide behind legal technicalities!" Granted. "This will allow revolutionists to conduct a camouflaged propaganda!" Granted. "The results may be dangerous!" Granted; all granted. And yet we cannot do otherwise, because all the harm the

Bolsheviks might do by clever abuse of their freedom to think and speak, would be as nothing to the harm done by denying them that freedom.

This harm would be manifold. In the first place, such action would tend to defeat its own object and to encourage rather than suppress revolutionary unrest, because for every camouflaged Bolshevik who might be smoked out and laid by the heels ten free spirits would be impelled to become revolutionists, since in their eyes (singular paradox!) Bolshevism would be associated with liberty. In the second place, any serious curtailment of free speech would render impossible the formation of that intelligent public opinion which we have already seen to be so necessary for comprehending difficulties and conceiving effective remedies. Lastly, such a policy would paralyze intellectual activity, enthrone reaction, and block progress. To protect society from disruption, however necessary, is merely part of a larger whole. Social order must be preserved, because that is the vital prerequisite of constructive progress. But—constructive progress must take place. Things cannot be left as they are, because under present conditions we are headed toward racial impoverishment and cultural decline. Our chief hope is the scientific spirit. But that spirit thrives only on unfettered knowledge and truth. Lacking this sustenance, it withers and decays. One of Bolshevism's deadly sins is its brutal crushing of intellectual freedom. Shall we be guilty of the very crime we so abhor in our enemies? What a wretched outcome: to escape the destructive tyranny of Bolshevism only to fall under the petrifying tyranny of bourbonism!

Heaven be praised, humanity is not restricted to so poor a choice. Another path lies open—the path of race-betterment. And science points the way. We already know enough to make a sure start, and increasing knowledge will guide our footsteps as we move on. That is the hopeful aspect of the situation. We do not have to guess. *We know.* All we need to do is to apply what we have already learned and keep on using our brains. The result will be such a combined increase of knowledge and creative intelligence that many problems, to-day

insuperable, will solve themselves.

Furthermore, science, which points the path to the future, gives us hope for the present as well. *Materially* the forces of chaos may still be growing, especially through racial impoverishment; but *morally* they are being undermined. Science, especially biology, is cutting the ground from under their feet. Even a decade ago, when errors like environmentalism and "natural equality" were generally accepted, the Under-Man was able to make out a plausible case. To-day the basic importance of heredity and the real nature of inferiority are becoming more and more widely understood and appreciated.

Indeed, it is this very spread of scientific truth which accounts largely for the growing violence of social unrest. Consciously or instinctively the revolutionary leaders feel that the "moral imponderables" have deserted them, and that they must therefore rely more and more upon force. Does not Bolshevism admit that it cannot peacefully convert the world, but can triumph only by the dictatorship of a ruthless minority, destroying whole classes, and then forcibly transforming the remaining population by a long process of intensive propaganda extending perhaps for generations? What a monstrous doctrine? *But, also, what a monumental confession of moral bankruptcy!* This is the counsel of desperation, not the assurance of victory.

That which maddens Bolshevism is, however, our inspiration. To us science speaks. And her words are: "*Sursum corda! Lift up your hearts!* Have faith in yourselves; in your civilization; in your race. Tread confidently the path I have revealed to you. Ye know the truth, and the truth shall make you free!"

CHAPTER VIII — NEO-ARISTOCRACY

STRESSFUL transition is the key-note of our time. Unless all signs be at fault, we stand at one of those momentous crises in history when mankind moves from one well-marked epoch into another of widely different character. Such crucial periods are of supreme importance, because their outcome may determine man's course for many generations—perhaps for many centuries.

Transition spells struggle. And this is pre-eminently true of to-day. Historians of the distant future, appraising our times, may conclude that the Great War was merely a symptom—an episode in a much vaster struggle of ideas and elemental forces which began long before the war, and lasted long after its close. Certainly such a conflict of ideas is to-day raging. Perhaps never in human annals have principles so dissimilar striven so fiercely for mastery of the coming age.

Now, in this conflict the ultimate antagonists appear to be biology and Bolshevism: Bolshevism, the incarnation of the atavistic past; biology, the hope of a progressive future. To call Bolshevism the incarnation of the past may sound paradoxical if we heed its claims to being ultramodern. But we have weighted those claims and have found them mere camouflage. What we have found is that Bolshevism, instead of being very new, is very old, that it is the last of a long series of revolts by the unadaptable, inferior, and degenerate elements against civilizations which have irked them and which they have therefore wished to destroy. The only new thing about Bolshevism is its "rationalizing" of rebellious emotions into an exceedingly insidious and persuasive philosophy of revolt which has not merely welded all the real social rebels, but has also deluded many misguided dupes, blind to what Bolshevism implies. Such is the champion of the old, primitive past, intrenched behind ancient errors like environmentalism and "natural equality," favored by the unrest of transition times, and reinforced by ever-multiplying swarms of degenerates and inferiors.

Against this formidable adversary stands biology, the champion of the new. Biology is one of the finest fruits of the modern scientific spirit.

Ripened by the patient labors of earnest seekers after truth, biology has now attained a splendid maturity. Forth from a thousand quiet laboratories and silent library alcoves have emerged discoveries which may completely alter human destiny. These discoveries constitute the *new biological revelation*—the mightiest transformation of ideas that the world has ever seen. Here, indeed, is something new: the unveiling of the mysterious life process, the discovery of the true path of progress, the placing in man's hands of the possibility of his own perfection by methods at once safe and sure. Such is the young science of applied biology; or, as it is more generally termed, "Eugenics'—the science of race betterment. Eugenics is, in fact, evolving into a higher synthesis, drawing freely from other fields of knowledge like psychology and the social sciences, and thus fitting itself ever more completely for its exalted task.

The fundamental change of both ideas and methods involved in the eugenic programme is at once apparent. Hitherto all political and social philosophies, however much they might differ among themselves have been agreed on certain principles: they have all believed that *environment* was of basic importance, and they have all proposed to improve mankind *from without,* by changing *existing individuals* through the action of various political and social agencies. Eugenics, on the other hand, believes that *heredity* is the basic factor, and plans to improve the race *from within,* by determining *which* existing individuals shall, and shall not, produce succeeding generations. This means the establishment of an *improved* social selection based upon *biological* considerations instead of, as hitherto, upon environmental considerations. Of course, this new selection would operate mainly through the old social and political agencies; but these would no longer be regarded as having specific virtue in themselves, and would be applied only in so far as they tended to better the race. Eugenics does not deny the effect of environment: on the contrary, it is precisely because of environment's bad effects upon the race that the science of eugenics has become such a vital necessity. What eugenics does say, however, is that environment however powerful, is an

indirect, secondary factor; the direct, primary factor being heredity. Therefore, all environmental influences should be considered with reference to heredity, which should always be the fundamental consideration. Thus a new criterion of policy and action is set up for every field of human activity, thereby involving a general revaluation of all values.

The eugenic programme may be thus succinctly stated: "The problem of eugenics is to make such legal, social, and economic adjustments that (1) a larger proportion of superior persons will have children than at present; (2) that the average number of offspring of each superior person will be greater than at present; (3) that the most inferior persons will have no children; and (4) that other inferior persons will have fewer children than now."

Of course, eugenics does not propose to attain its objective in a day or at a stroke. Inspired as it is by the scientific spirit, it believes in evolution, not revolution, and is thus committed to strictly evolutionary methods. Eugenics advocates no sudden leap into an untried Utopia; it desires to take no steps which have not been scientifically tested, and even then only when these have gained the approval of intelligent public opinion. Eugenics does claim, however, that the momentous scientific discoveries of the past half century enable mankind to make a sound start in the process of race betterment. It further claims that such a start is imperative, because racial impoverishment is today going on so fast, and the forces of social disruption are growing so ominously, that delay threatens speedy disaster.

The truth is that our race is facing the most acute crisis in its history. The very progress of science, which affords our best hope for the future, has thus far rather intensified the peril. Not only are all the traditional factors of race decadence operative, but new factors which *may* become powerful agents of race betterment are at present working mainly in the direction of racial decay, by speeding up both the social sterilization of superior stocks and the multiplication of inferiors. The result is a process of racial impoverishment, extremely

rapid and ever accelerating.

As the English biologist Whetham justly remarks: “The sense of social responsibility, the growth of moral consciousness, have matched a certain point among us—a point that the student of sociology may well call a *danger-point*. If, accepting the burden of moulding the destinies of the race, we relieve nature of her office of discriminating between the fit and the unfit; if we undertake the protection of the weaker members of the community; if we assume a corporate responsibility for the existence of all sorts and conditions of men; then, unless we are prepared to cast away the labors of our forefathers and to vanish with the empires of the past, we must accept the office of deciding who are the fittest to prosper and to leave offspring, who are the persons whose moral and intellectual worth make it right that they and their descendants should be placed in a position of prominence in our midst and which are the families on whose upbringing the time and money of society are best bestowed. We must acquiesce in the principle that the man who has made his five talents into ten shall profit by the skill and energy he has shown, and that the man who has repeatedly failed to use his one talent shall have no further chance of wasting the corporate resources on himself and his descendants.”

The effect of eugenic measures in *permanently* lightening social burdens should appeal strongly to a world staggering under difficulties. This does not mean that established methods of reform should be neglected. But it must be remembered that such methods, affecting as most of them do merely the environment, require a constant (if not increasing) expenditure to be kept up.

To quote Whetham again: “We must recognize an essential difference between the two methods. To put it briefly, it seems as though work done by heredity was work done once for all. The destruction of a tainted stock will leave a race eternally the better for its removal, the breeding-out of a good strain causes an irreparable loss; whereas improvements due to environment alone require a constant expenditure of energy to maintain them in existence. The one may be compared to an actual gain of capital as far as the human race is

concerned; the other involves a constant expenditure of income, perfectly justified as long as the increase in capital is maintained, but unjustifiable when capital must be drawn upon . …

"Looking at our problem in this light, we see that there must be some relation between the average innate capacity of a nation and the effect likely to be produced by the expenditure of a given amount of energy on improving the environment. If a race falls back in its inborn qualities; if, owing to the efforts of philanthropists and the burdens of unsound taxation, more of the failures of civilization reach maturity and parenthood, and fewer competent persons are brought into existence to support them, not only has the nation less energy to use for the maintenance and improvement of its social conditions, but such energy as is available will produce a correspondingly smaller effect. The old standard can be maintained, if at all, only by a policy of overspending leading to bankruptcy. We have, in fact, conditions in which retrogression has set in and the environment will follow the heredity downhill."

Another point to be emphasized is the necessity for seeing how environmental measures affect racial interests. One of the gravest objections to environmentalism is its tendency to look at social and political reforms as ends in themselves. Scrutinized from the racial viewpoint, many of these reforms reveal racially harmful consequences, which more than offset their beneficial aspects and so require their modification in order to be desirable in the long run. Take the matter of poor relief, for example. Its necessity and desirability are generally acknowledged. Yet, however pathetic may be the objects of public charity, the interests of society and the race alike require that poor relief carry with it one imperative obligation: habitual paupers should be prevented from having children. Otherwise charity will merely mean more paupers—a result harmful and unfair both to the thrifty and capable members of society who pay the taxes and to society itself which ought to expend its taxes as far as possible for productive purposes.

Again, take the question of the "social ladder." We have already

observed how the ability of superior individuals to rise easily in the social scale is characteristic of a progressive civilization. This is something which no well-informed and right-thinking man can deny. Accordingly, the furtherance of the "career open to talent" is the constant solicitude of social reformers. And yet, here too, the racial view-point is needed. Suppose the "social ladder" were so perfected that virtually all ability could be detected and raised to its proper social level. The immediate result would be a tremendous display of talent and genius. But if this problem were considered merely by itself, if no measures were devised to counteract the age-old tendency toward the social sterilization and elimination of successful superiors, that display of talent would be but the prelude to utter racial impoverishment and irreparable racial and cultural decline. As things now stand, it is the very imperfections of the "social ladder" which retard racial impoverishment and minimize its disastrous consequences.

Remembering the necessity for viewing all political and social projects in the light of racial consequences, let us now consider the eugenic programme itself. The problem of race betterment consists of two distinct phases: the multiplication of superior individuals and the elimination of inferiors—in other words, the exact reverse of what is to-day taking place. These two phases of race betterment clearly require totally different methods. The multiplication of superiors is a process of race building; the elimination of inferiors is a process of race cleansing. These processes are termed "Positive" and "Negative" eugenics, respectively.

Although race building is naturally of more transcendent interest than race cleansing, it is the latter that we will first consider. Race cleansing is the obvious starting-point for race betterment. Here scientific knowledge is most advanced, the need for action most apparent, and public opinion best informed. In fact, a beginning has already been made. The segregation of the insane and feebleminded in public institutions is the first step in a campaign against degeneracy which should extend rapidly as society awakens to the full gravity of

the situation. We have already seen how much graver is the problem than has ordinarily been supposed. We now know that the so-called "degenerate classes" are not sharply marked off from the rest of the community, but are merely the most afflicted sufferers from taints which extend broadcast through the general population. The "degenerate classes" are, in fact, merely the nucleus of that vast "outer fringe" of mental and physical unsoundness visible all the way from the unemployable "casual laborer" right up to the "tainted genius."

Degeneracy is thus a cancerous blight, constantly spreading, tainting and spoiling sound stocks, destroying race values, and increasing social burdens. In fact, degeneracy not only handicaps society but threatens its very existence. Congenitally incapable of adjusting themselves to an advanced social order, the degenerate inevitably become its enemies—particularly those "high-grade defectives" who are the natural fomenters of social unrest. Of course, the environmentalist argues that social unrest is due to bad social conditions, but when we go into the matter more deeply we find that bad conditions are due largely to bad people. The mere presence of hordes of low-grade men and woman condemned by their very natures to incompetency and failure automatically engender poverty, invite exploitation, and drag down others just above them in the social scale.

We thus see that our social ills are largely the product of degeneracy, and that the elimination of degeneracy would do more than anything else to solve them. But degeneracy can be eliminated only by eliminating the degenerate. And this is a racial, not a social matter. No merely social measures can ever touch the heart of the problem. In fact, they tend to increase its gravity; because, aiming as they do to improve existing individuals, they carry along multitudes of the unfit and enable them to propagate more largely of their kind.

If, then, society is ever to rid itself of its worst burdens, social reform must be increasingly supplemented by racial reform. Unfit individuals as well as unjust social conditions must be eliminated. To make a better world we must have better men and women. No reform of laws

or institutions or economic systems will bring that better world unless it produces better men and women too.

Society must, therefore, grapple resolutely with the problem of degeneracy. The first step should be the prevention of all obvious degenerates from having children. This would mean, in practice, segregating most of them in institutions. Of course, that, in turn, would mean a great immediate expense. But in the long run such outlays would be the truest economy. We have already seen how expensive degenerates are to society. A single degenerate family like the Jukes may cost the state millions of dollars. And to these direct costs there must be added indirect costs which probably run to far larger figures. Think of the loss to the national wealth, measured in mere dollars and cents, of a sound, energetic stock ruined by an infusion of Jukes blood. Think of the immeasurably greater loss represented by a "tainted genius," his talents perverted from a potential social blessing into an actual social curse by the destructive action of a degenerate strain in his heredity.

However, even if we leave all indirect damage out of consideration, the direct costs of degeneracy are so obvious and so computable that, as a cold financial proposition, the flotation of public bond issues to defray the expenses of immediate, wholesale segregation would be amply justified. The consequent diminution in the numbers of paupers, vagabonds, criminals, etc., would unquestionably enable the State to get all its money back with a handsome profit besides.

Of course, even the rigorous segregation of all clearly defective individuals now alive would not extinguish degeneracy. The vast "outer fringe" would for generations produce large quotas of institutional recruits. But these quotas would get steadily smaller, because the centres of pollution would have been removed. And, this once done, the racial stream would gradually purify itself. Remember that race cleansing, once done, is done for good and all. The whole weight of scientific evidence shows that degeneracy is caused, not by environment, but by heredity; that the degeneracy with which we have to deal is an old degeneracy due to taints which have been

carried along in the germ-plasm for generations. If, then, this mass of degeneracy, the accumulation of centuries, could be once got rid of, it would never again recur. Sporadic degenerates might now and then be born but these isolated cases, leaving no offspring, would be of negligible importance.

We thus see that a general and consistent application of those methods which even now are approved by public opinion, and are already practiced on a small scale would suffice to cleanse the race of its worst impurities. Of course, if no further methods were adopted, the process would be a slow one. The unsound "fringe" is so wide, the numbers of less obvious defectives above the present committable" line are so large, and their birth-rate tends to be so high that unless many of these grades also were debarred from having children, by either segregation or sterilization, at least two or three generations would probably elapse before the recurrent quotas of defectives would be markedly reduced. Meanwhile, society would continue to suffer from the burdens and dangers which widespread degeneracy involves. Whether these risks are to be run is for public opinion to decide. Public opinion is to-day probably not ready to take more than the "first step" suggested above: the wholesale segregation of our obvious defectives. This makes some advocates of race betterment impatient or pessimistic. But it should not. Such persons should remember that the great thing is to take a real start in the right direction. When that first step is once taken, the good results will be so obvious that public opinion will soon be ready for further advances along the same line.

One point which should hasten the conversion of public opinion to the eugenic programme is its profound humaneness. Eugenics is stern toward bad *stocks,* but toward the *individual* it is always kind. When eugenics says "the degenerate must be eliminated," it refers, not to existing degenerates, but to their potential offspring. Those potential children, if eugenics has its way, will never be. This supreme object once accomplished, however, there is every reason why the defective individual should he treated with all possible consideration. In fact, in a society animated by eugenic principles, degenerates, and inferiors

generally, would he treated far better than they are to-day; because such a society would not have to fear that more charity would spell more inferiors. It would also be more inclined to a kindly attitude because it would realize that defects are due to heredity and that bad germ-plasm can be neither punished nor reformed.

Furthermore, the very conversion of public opinion to the eugenic view-point would itself tend powerfully to purify the race by voluntary action. Legal measures like segregation and sterilization would apply in practice only to the most inferior elements, whose lack of intelligence and self-control render them incapable of appreciating the interests of society and thus make legal compulsion necessary. The higher grades of unsoundness would not be directly affected. Right here, however, the pressure of enlightened public opinion would come into play. Later on we shall consider the full implications of the development in the general population of a true racial consciousness—what may be termed a "eugenic conscience." Suffice it here to say that the existence of such as attitude would eliminate the higher grades of mental defect by voluntary action as rapidly as the acuter grades were being eliminated by legal action. In a society animated by a eugenic conscience the begetting of unsound children would be regarded with horror, and public opinion would instinctively set up strong social taboos which would effectively restrain all except reckless and antisocial individuals—who, of course, would be restrained by law.

Such social taboos would not, however, mean wholesale celibacy. In the first place, a large proportion of those persons who carry hereditary taints in their germ-plasm carry them in latent form. These latent or "recessive" taints do their bearers personally no harm, and in most cases will not appear in their children unless the bearers marry persons carrying like taints. By avoiding unions with these particular people, not only will sound children be reasonably assured by wise matings, but the taints themselves will ordinarily be bred out of the stock in a couple of generations, and the germ-plasm will thus be purified. Furthermore, even those persons who carry taints which

make parenthood inadvisable need not be debarred from marriage. The sole limitation would be that they should have no children. And this will be perfectly feasible, because, when public opinion acquires the racial view-point, the present silly and vicious attitude toward birth control will be abandoned, and undesirable children will not be conceived.

By the combination of legal, social, and individual action above described, the problems of degeneracy and inferiority, attacked both from above and from below, would steadily diminish, and the racial stream would be as steadily purified. The point to be emphasized is that this can be effected almost wholly by a broader and more intelligent application of processes already operating and already widely sanctioned by public opinion. Segregation of defectives, appreciation of racial principles, wise marriage selection, birth control: these are the main items in the programme of race purification. This programme is thus seen to be strictly evolutionary and essentially conservative. The first steps are so simple and so obvious that they can be taken without any notable change in our social or legal standards, and without any real offence to intelligent public opinion. Further steps can safely be left to the future, and there is good reason to believe that those steps will be taken far sooner than is generally imagined, because the good results of the first steps will be so apparent and so convincing.

Such, briefly, is the process of race cleansing known as “negative” eugenics. Many earnest believers in race betterment are inclined to minimize eugenics’ “negative” aspect. Such persons declare that the vital problem is the increase of superiors, and that the “positive” pluses of the eugenic programme must, therefore, be equally emphasized from the start.

Now, in this I think they are mistaken. Of course, the increase of superior types is an absolute prerequisite to the perfecting of the race. But race perfecting is a much more difficult matter than race cleansing and involves measures for most of which public opinion is not yet prepared. Also, besides questions of expediency, there is the more

fundamental point that race cleansing will do more than anything else to assure that social and intellectual stability which will constitute the sure foundation on which race building can take place.

In considering the problems of degeneracy and inferiority, many eugenicists are apt to fix their attention upon the so-called "defective classes," and to regard them as a separate problem. This is, of course, not so. The defective classes are not sundered from the rest of society; they are merely the acutest sufferers from defects which, in lesser degree, spread broadcast through the general population. These defects, continually spreading and infecting sound stocks, set up strains, discords, and limitations of character and personality of every kind and description. Consequently, the elimination of morbidity, of weakness, of unintelligence, would work wonders not only in harmonizing and stabilizing individual personalities, but also in harmonizing and stabilizing society itself.

Picture a society where the overwhelming majority of the population possessed sound minds in sound bodies; where the "tainted genius" and the "unemployable" wastrel were alike virtually unknown. Even though the bulk of the population were still of mediocre intelligence, the gain for both stability and progress would be enormous. The elimination of neurotic, irrational, vicious personalities, weak-brained and weak-willed, would render social cataclysms impossible; because even those who could not think far would tend to think straight, and would realize that social disruption could not really benefit any one who stood to gain by social order and progress. Of course, the mediocre masses would be decidedly conservative and would hold back progress; but their conservatism would be much more leavened by common sense, cooperation, and public spirit than is now the case, and constructive proposals would thus get a fairer hearing and stand a better chance of adoption.

Now, when we contrast this picture with our present-day world, disorganized, seething, threatened with downright chaos, I submit that some such stabilization as I have described must first be attained before we can devote ourselves to creating a super race. Our

particular job is stopping the prodigious spread of inferiority which is now going on. We may be losing our best stocks, but we are losing them much more slowly than we are multiplying our worst. Our study of differential birth-rates showed us that if these remain unchanged our most intelligent stocks will diminish from one-third to two-thirds in the next hundred years; it also showed that our least intelligent stocks will increase from six to tenfold in the same time. Obviously, it is this prodigious spawning of inferiors which must at all costs be prevented if society is to be saved from disruption and dissolution. Race cleansing is apparently the only thing that can stop it. Therefore, race cleansing must be our first concern.

Of course, this does not mean that race building should be neglected. On the contrary, we should be thinking along those lines. Only, for the immediate present, we should concentrate our energies upon the pressing problem of degeneracy until we have actually in operation legal measures which will fairly promise to get it under control. Meanwhile, the very fact that we are thinking eugenically at all will of itself produce important positive results. These may not take the form of legal enactments, but they will be powerfully reflected in changed ideals and standards of social conduct. The development of that "eugenic conscience" which, as we have already seen, promises to play so important a part in the elimination of the higher grades of degeneracy, will also impel the well-endowed to raise larger families, prefer children to luxuries, and discriminate between the high cost of living and the cost of high living. People will think less about "rights" and more about "duties," will come to consider their race much as they do their country, and will make sacrifices for posterity such as they now make for patriotism.

In fact, such an attitude will soon render public opinion ripe for considering definite eugenic measures of a constructive character. One of these measures, which is already foreshadowed, is a remission of taxation proportionate to the number of children in families. Later on society may offer rewards for the production of desirable children. Such action will, however, have to be very carefully safeguarded. Any

indiscriminate subsidizing of large families regardless of their racial value would be extremely disastrous. It would mean merely another tax burden upon the thrifty and capable for the stimulation of the unfit—who need no stimulating! Only where the racial superiority of the couples in question is clearly apparent, as shown by proven ability, pscychological tests, and sound heredity, should such subsidies be granted.

These and a few other kindred matters are probably the only definitely constructive legal measures for which public opinion is even partially prepared. But there is nothing discouraging in that. The great thing, as already stated, is to get people thinking racially. With the development of a "eugenic conscience" and the curbing of degeneracy, plans for race building will almost formulate themselves. There is the inestimable advantage of a movement based on the evolutionary principle and inspired by the scientific spirit. Such a movement does not, like a scheme for utopia, have to spring forth in detailed perfection from the imagination of its creator like Minerva from the brow of Zeus. On the contrary, it can *evolve,* steadily but surely, moving along many lines, testing its own soundness at every step, and winning favor by proofs instead of promises.

> "There are several routes on which one can proceed with the confidence that, if no one of them is the main road, at least it is likely to lead into the latter at some time. Fortunately, eugenics is, paradoxical as it may seem, able to advance on all these paths at once; for it proposes no definite goal, it sets up no one standard to which it would make the human race conform. Taking man as it finds him, it proposes to multiply *all* the types that have been found by past experience or present reason to be of most value to society. Not only would it multiply them in numbers, but also in efficiency, in capacity to serve the race.
>
> By so doing, it undoubtedly fulfils the requirements of that popular philosophy which holds the aim of society to be the greatest happiness for the greatest number, or, more definitely, the increase of the totality of human happiness to cause not to

exist those who would be doomed from birth to give only unhappiness to themselves and those about them; to increase the number of those in whom useful physical and mental traits are well developed; to bring about an increase in the number of energetic altruists and a decrease in the number of the antisocial and defective; surely such an undertaking will come nearer to increasing the happiness of the greatest number than will any temporary social palliative, any ointment for incurable social wounds."

If social stability can be maintained and a cataclysm averted, there is every reason to believe that our world will soon take a decided turn for the better. The new biological revelation is already accepted by large numbers of thinking men and women all over the civilized world, and when it becomes firmly fixed in the popular consciousness it will work a literally amazing transformation in the ordering of the world's affairs.

For race betterment is such an intensely *practical,* matter! When peoples come to realize that the *quality* of the population is the source of all their prosperity, progress, security, and even existence; when they realize that a single genius be worth more in actual dollars than a dozen gold-mines, while, conversely, racial decadence spells material impoverishment and cultural delay; when such things are really *believed,* we shall see eugenics actually molding social programmes and political policies.

And, as already stated, there is much evidence to show that this may happen sooner than is now imagined. Many believers in race betterment are unduly pessimistic. Of course, their pessimism is quite natural. Realizing as they do the supreme importance of the eugenic idea, its progress seems to them unconscionably slow. To the student of history, however, its progress seems extraordinarily rapid. Only twenty years ago eugenics was virtually unknown outside of a few scientific circles. Today it has won a firm footing with the intellectual elite of every civilized land and has gained the interested attention of public opinion. History shows that when an idea has reached this point

it tends to spread with ever-accelerating rapidity. In my opinion, then, eugenists, whether laboring in the abstract field of research for the further elucidation of the idea or in engaged in enlightening public opinion, may one and all look forward hopefully to the operation of a sort of "law of increasing returns" that will yield results as surprising as they are beneficent as the next few decades roll on.

The one deadly peril to the cause of race betterment is the possibility of social disruption by the antisocial elements—instinctively hostile to eugenics as they are to every other phase of progressive civilization. If this peril can be averted, the triumph of race betterment is practically certain, *because eugenics can "deliver the goods."* When public opinion once realizes this, public opinion will be not merely willing but anxious that the goods be delivered. When society realizes the incalculable value of superior stocks, it will take precious good care that its racial treasures are preserved and fostered. Superior stock will then be cherished, not only for its high average value, but because it is also the seed-bed from which alone can arise those rare personalities of genius who tower like mountain peaks above the human plain and to whose creative influence progress is primarily due

The people which fosters its superior stocks will be thus twice blessed. In the first place, such stocks will produce, generation after generation, an unfailing supply of men and women of ability, of energy, of civic worth, who will leaven society and advance every field of human endeavor. And, in addition to all this, those same stocks will from time to time produce a "genius"—one of those infinitely rare but infinitely precious minds which change man's destiny and whose names reverberate athwart the ages.

> "Every race requires leaders. These leaders appear from time to time, and enough is known about eugenics to show that their appearance is frequently predictable, not accidental. It is possible to have them appear more frequently; and, in addition, to raise the level of the whole race, making the entire nation happier and more useful. These are the great tasks of eugenics. America needs more families like that old Puritan strain which is

one of eugenics' familiar examples:

> At their head stands Jonathan Edwards, and behind him an array of his descendants numbering, in the year 1900, 1,394, of whom 1,295 were college graduates; 13 presidents of our greatest colleges; 65 professors in colleges, besides many principals of other important educational institutions; 60 physicians, many of whom were eminent; 100 and more clergymen, missionaries, or theological professors; 75 were officers in the army and navy; 60 prominent authors and writers, by whom 135 books of merit were written and published and 18 important periodicals edited, 33 American States and several foreign countries have profited by the beneficent influences of their eminent activity; 100 and more were lawyers, of whom one was our most eminent professor of law; 30 were judges; 80 held public office, of whom one was vice-president of the United States; 3 were United States senators; several were governors, members of Congress, framers of State constitutions, mayors of cities, and ministers to foreign courts; one was president of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company; 15 railroads, many banks, insurance companies, and large industrial enterprises have been indebted to their management. Almost if not every department of social progress, and of the public weal has felt the impulse of this healthy and long-lived family. It is not known that any one of them was ever convicted of crime."

Such is the record of the Jonathan Edwards strain. Now compare it with the Jukes strain? Edwards vs. Jukes! Faced by such evidence, can public opinion, remain much longer blind to the enormous innate differences between human stocks?

The Edwards family record illustrates a principle of vital importance: the infinite diversity of ability. Many ill-informed or prejudiced critics have asserted that eugenics visualizes a specific type of "superman" and wants to "breed for points." This is arrant nonsense. No real eugenist wants to do anything of the sort, for the very good reason that the eugenist realizes better than any one else that the

fundamental quality of superior germplasm is its *generalized creative urge*—expressing itself in a multitude of specific activities.

What eugenics wants is "more physically sound men and women *with greater ability in any valuable way.* Whatever the actual goal of evolution may be, it can hardly be assumed by any except the professional pessimist that a race made up of such men and women is going to be handicapped by their presence.

> "The correlation of abilities is as well attested as any fact in psychology. Those who decry eugenics on the ground that it is impossible to establish any 'standard of perfection,' since society needs many diverse kinds of people, are overlooking this fact. Any plan which increases the production of children in able families of *various* types will thereby produce more ability of all kinds since if family is particularly gifted in one way, it is likely to be gifted above the average in several other desirable ways.
>
> Eugenics sets up no specific superman as a type to which the rest of the race must be made to conform. It is not looking forward to the cessation of its work in a eugenic millennium. It is a *perpetual process,* which seeks only to raise the level of the race by the production of fewer people with physical and mental defects, and more people with physical and mental excellences. Such a race should be able to perpetuate itself, to subdue nature, to improve its environment progressively; its' members should be happy and productive. To establish such a goal seems justified by the knowledge of evolution which is now available; and to make progress toward it is possible."

The eugenic ideal is thus seen to be *an ever-perfecting super race.* Not the "superman" of Nietzsche—that brilliant yet baleful vision of a master *caste,* blooming like a gorgeous but parasitic orchid on a rotting trunk of servile degradation; but a super *race,* cleansing itself *throughout* by the elimination of its defects, and raising itself *throughout* by the cultivation of its qualities.

Such a race will imply a new civilization. Of course, even under the

most favorable circumstances, neither this race nor this civilization can come today or to-morrow—perhaps not for many generations; because, like all really enduring creations, they will be the products of a progressive, evolutionary process, not of flaming revolution or numbing reaction.

Yet this evolutionary process, however gradual, must ultimately produce changes almost beyond our dreams. Every phase of human existence will be transformed: laws and customs, arts and sciences, ideas and ideals, even man's conception of the Infinite.

How shall we characterize this society of the future? I believe it may be best visualized by one word: *Neo-Aristocracy.* The ideal of race perfection combines and harmonizes into a higher synthesis the hitherto conflicting ideas of aristocracy and democracy. I am here referring not to the specific political aspects which those ideas have at various times assumed, but to their broader aspects as philosophies of life and conduct.

Viewed in this fundamental light, we see democracy based upon the concept of human *similarity,* and aristocracy based upon the concept of human *differentiation.* Of course, both concepts are, in a sense, valid. Compared to the vast differences between mankind and other life forms, human differences sink to insignificance and mankind appears a substantial unity. Compared with each other, the wide differences between men themselves stand out, and mankind becomes an almost infinite diversity.

If these distinctions had been clearly recognized, democracy and aristocracy would have been viewed as parts of a larger truth, and there might have been no deep antagonism between them. Unfortunately, both concepts were formulated long ago, when science was in its infancy and when the laws of life were virtually unknown. Accordingly, both were founded largely on false notions: democracy upon the fallacy of *natural equality;* aristocracy upon the fallacy of *artificial inequality.*

Thus based on error, both democracy and aristocracy worked badly in

practice: democracy tending to produce a destructive, levelling equality; aristocracy tending to produce an unjust oppressive inequality. This merely increased the antagonism between the two systems, because one was continually invoked to cure the harm wrought by the other, and because social ills were ascribed exclusively to the defeated party, instead of being diagnosed as a joint product.

For the past half century the democratic idea has gained an unparalleled ascendancy in the world, while the aristocratic idea has been correspondingly discredited. Indeed, so complete has been democracy's triumph that it has been accorded a superstitious veneration, and any criticism of its fundamental perfection is widely regarded as a sort of lese-majeste or even heresy.

Now, this is an unhealthy state of affairs, because the democratic idea is not perfect but is a mixture of truth with errors like "natural equality" which modern science has proved to be clearly unsound. Such a situation is unworthy of an age claiming to be inspired by that scientific spirit whose basic quality is unflinching love of truth. In a scientific age no idea should be sacrosanct, no facts above analysis and criticism. Of course, criticism and analysis should be measured and scientific—not mere outbursts of emotion. Traditional ideas should receive just consideration, with due regard for the fact that they must contain much truth to have established and maintained themselves. In like manner, new ideas should also receive just consideration so long as their advocates strive to persuade people and do not try to knock their brains out. But, new or old, no idea should be made a fetich—and democracy is no exception to the rule. As *an idea,* democracy should be thoughtfully, even respectfully, considered, as something which contains a deal of truth and which has done much good in the world. As *a fetich,* democracy has no more virtue than Mumbo-Jumbo or a West African ju-ju.

The fact is that modern science is unquestionably bringing the democratic dogma under review. And it is high time that scientists said so frankly. Nothing would be more laughable, if it were not so pathetic, than the way scientists interlard their writings (which clearly

imply criticism of the democratic philosophy) with asides like: “Of course, this isn’t really against democracy, you know.”

Now, these little pinches of incense cast upon the democratic altar may keep near-heretics in good standing. But it is unworthy of the scientific spirit, and (what is more important) it seriously retards progress. Genuine progress results from combining old and new truth into a higher synthesis which, bound by inherent affinity, will, like a chemical combination, “stay put.” Arbitrarily coupling truth and error, however, results in something which compares, not to chemical synthesis, but to a mechanical mixture about as stable as oil and water, which will be forever separating and must be continually shaken up. Obviously, out of such a mixture no new synthesis can ever come.

When, therefore, believers in race betterment are accused of being “undemocratic,” they should answer: “Right you are! Science, especially biology, has disclosed the falsity of certain ideas like ‘natural equality,’ and the omnipotence of environment, on which the democratic concept is largely based. We aim to take the sound elements in both the traditional democratic and aristocratic philosophies and combine them in a higher synthesis—a new philosophy worthy of the race and the civilization that we visualize.”

Of course, it may be asked why, if this new philosophy is such a synthesis, it might not be called “Aristo-democracy,” or even “Neo-Democracy.” To which I would answer that I have no basic objection, provided we all agree on the facts. Labels matter comparatively little. It is the things labelled which count.

Yet, after all, labels do have a certain value. If they mean precisely what they say, this in turn means exact information as to the facts and hence avoids the possibility of unsound reasoning based on faulty premises. Now, I believe that, for the time being at any rate, the new philosophy should he called “Neo-Aristocracy”; because it involves first of all the disestablishment of the democratic *cult* and the rehabilitation of the discredited aristocratic idea. For, despite its many unsound elements, the aristocratic idea does contain something

ennobling which must be preserved and incorporated into the philosophy of the morrow. Today, therefore, the value of the aristocratic principle should he emphasized as a healthy intellectual reaction against the overweening preponderance of the democratic idea. Generations hence, when the elimination of degeneracy, and even of mediocrity shall have produced something like generalized superiority, the approach to *real* equality between men will have become so evident that their philosophy of life may better be termed "Neo-Democracy." Other times, other fashions. Let us not usurp the future. One last point should be carefully noted. When I speak of Neo-Aristocracy as applicable to-day, I refer to outlook, not practice. At present no basic political changes are either possible or desirable. Certainly, any thought of our existing social upper classes as "Neo-Aristocracies" would be, to put it mildly, a bad joke. We have already seen that, while these classes do unquestionably contain the largest percentage of superior strains, they are yet loaded down with mediocrities and are peppered with degenerates and inferiors. We must absolutely banish the notion that Neo-Aristocracy will perpetuate that cardinal vice of traditional aristocracy.—*caste*. *Classes* there probably will be; but these classes, however defined their functions, will be extremely fluid as regards the individuals who compose them. No true superior, wherever born, will be denied admission to the highest class; no person, whenever born, can stay in a class unless he measures up to specifications.

The attainment of Neo-Aristocracy implies a long political evolution, the exact course of which is probably unpredictable. However a recognition of the goal and of the fundamental principles involved should help us on our way.

That way will assuredly be long. At best, it will probably take many generations. It may take many centuries. Who knows whether our present hopes are not dreams; whether the forces of chaos will not disrupt civilization and plunge us into a "Dark Age."

Well, even so, there would be left—faith. For, may we not believe that those majestic laws of life which now stand revealed will no more pass

utterly from human ken than have other great discoveries like the sowing of grain and the control of fire? And, therefore, may we not hope that, if not to-day, then in some better time, the race will insure its own regeneration? To doubt this would be to deny that mysterious, primal urge which, raising man from the beast, lifts his eyes to the stars.

HERITAGE